



GREEN HORIZON

Magazine

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL PUBLISHED BY THE GREEN HORIZON FOUNDATION

PIERCING THE GLOOM

Showing the Way

FORWARD

by Taking

ACTION

JILL STEIN AND CHERI HONKALA • STEVE WELZER • DAVID SCHWARTZMAN
BRIAN KENT • MAYNARD KAUFMAN • MARK SATIN • PAM HARTWELL-HERRERO
KAT WILLIAMS • GREEN PARTY SWEDEN: RALPH MONÖ
GREEN PARTY JAPAN: RICHARD EVANOFF

TABLE of CONTENTS

We'll be doing more with the web.	2
America the Possible	2
Letter from Barbara Rodgers-Hendricks. . .	2
The GHM Team	2
<hr/>	
Guide to This Issue	3
JOHN RENSENBRINK	
Jill Stein's Presidential Campaign Message	5
Thoughts for my Grandchildren	8
STEVE WELZER	
A Rapid Solar Transition Possible and Imperative	10
DAVID SCHWARTZMAN	
Back to the Land, Too	14
BRIAN KENT	
Saving the Earth in our Backyards	17
MAYNARD KAUFMAN	
Miraculous Birth of the "Ten Key Values" Statement	19
MARK SATIN	
The Greens Have Taken Over and All is Well!	23
PAM HARTWELL-HERERO	
Why I am not Green...yet.	25
KAT WILLIAMS	
The Swedish Greens - Which Way Forward.	27
RALPH MONO	
New Green Party Launched in Japan.	30
RICHARD EVANOFF	
List of Sustainers.	31

www.Green-Horizon.org

Please make a donation via PayPal.

We'll be doing more with the Web!

Since April 2005, Green-Horizon.org has served the important purpose of providing us an informational presence on the web, a platform for Green blogging, and a channel for announcements about our work. But we feel it's time to do more!

So now, in pursuit of a more active online network and to reach out to new readers, our team is working to substantially upgrade the Green Horizon hub.

We're excited to announce that a dynamic new Green Horizon website is scheduled to launch in early 2013. We welcome your support during the development phase and encourage you to contact our Marketing and Communications Manager Brie Welzer (briewelz@gmail.com) to hear about how you could play a role in our website redesign.

*John Rensenbrink
Steve Welzer*

America the Possible

We wish to announce the publication of *America the Possible, a Manifesto for a New Economy* by one of our sustainers, James Gustave (Gus) Speth. It was published in August by Yale University Press (please google yalebooks.com).

Editors

LETTER FROM BARBARA RODGERS-HENDRICKS

I'd like to comment briefly on several articles in last spring's issue (Spring/Summer 2012).

Sam Smith concludes that "it is left to us – in our towns, counties and states, to redefine and change our nation to the way it should be." He advises the Green Party to run only local and state candidates. In general, I agree. I would make an exception for a presidential candidate, however. If we are to be taken seriously as a political party, I think we must have a presidential candidate on the ballot in all the states. But this candidate should be a dyed-in-the-wool Green.

Jay Walljasper uses the word "commons" to denote valuable assets which belong to everyone – "from clean air to wildlife preserves; the judicial system to the Internet; informal social networks that hold communities together to genetic building blocks of life". He speaks my language. I feel as though we are old friends, because I was reading the Utne Reader while he was editor.

Scott McLarty's piece on George Lakoff offers an instructive challenge to the Green Party: find your narrative! McLarty/Lakoff states that people do not generally make logical choices, especially in politics. "They often succumb to ruling-

continued on page 16...

THE TEAM

PUBLISHED BY THE GREEN HORIZON FOUNDATION • FALL/WINTER, 2012 • VOLUME NINE #26

EDITORS:

John Rensenbrink: john@ensenbrink.com
Steve Welzer: stevewelzer@msn.com

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF GREEN HORIZON FOUNDATION:

Ted Becker, Alabama	John Rensenbrink, Maine
Edmund P. Fowler, Ontario, Canada	Liz Rensenbrink, Maine
Greg Gerritt, Rhode Island	Sam Smith, Maine
Rhoda Gilman, Minnesota	Steve Welzer, New Jersey
Ellen LaConte, North Carolina	

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD:

Holly Hart, Iowa
Sam Smith, Maine

Inquiries, submissions,
subscriptions, letters:
GHM, PO Box 476
Topsham, ME 04086 USA

GRAPHIC DESIGN: Sharon Pieniak
www.bluecatmedia.com

LOGO DESIGN: Sean Hill

EDITORIAL ASSISTANCE:
Carla Rensenbrink

DATABASE: Asher Platts

MEMBERSHIP & BOOKKEEPING:
Liz Rensenbrink

MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER:
Brielle Welzer

Green Horizon Magazine is indexed in the Alternative Press Index, which is available from:
Alternative Press Center, PO Box 33109, Baltimore, MD 21218

“WE SHALL NOT BE MOVED!”

A guide to this issue

A flood of books and blogs overwhelm us with detailed and stark expositions of crises and catastrophes. Their authors are not sensationalists. They are knowledgeable, often painstakingly methodical in their research, they care about the world and are deadly serious.

But...where is the action from our institutions and their leaders that might be commensurate with the enormity of the threat? Action by the leaders at the top of the economy and the government is sluggish, episodic, and ineffective. Indeed, it seems that failure to deal characterizes super-elite leadership in almost all countries.

Not perceiving action to fit the dire need for action, the people slip into a skeptical attitude, or they dismiss the warnings as “cry wolf” (the Cassandra effect), or they go into massive denial. The flood of dire warnings act upon us therefore as a kind of narcotic, immunizing us from the reality of the situation. We watch the destitution and desolation portrayed by the many books and blogs as if we were in a movie theater and we are the spectators – what is portrayed is not happening to us and will not happen—what we are seeing is just another titillating “reality show”.

HOWEVER...

You are young or old (like me) or in your middle years. You are having an ordinary day doing the usual things to stay alive and hopefully thrive. Suddenly, out of the blue, you find yourself face to face with the unthinkable and unspeakable question, “suppose we don’t make it?” And the question will not go away.

In the 80’s, just a few decades ago, the world was caught up in the somber fears of a possible nuclear winter and the likely disappearance of our species. Recall or look up and read for the first time *The Fate of the Earth* by Jonathan Schell. We think we’ve learned to live with that prospect. More accurately we have found ways to ignore and deny it. The threat is more real than ever.

Adding to that threat and further deepening our descent to doom are the imminent collapse of the economy; rapid climate deterioration; steadily rising seas; melting of the polar ice; the consequent discovery of much more oil under the thinning ice and therefore now drill-able. This means that “Peak Oil” will come way too late if ever. This means that yes the new vast oil fields will be drilled and marketed by corporate men and women gone mad. As Bill McKibbin in an impassioned article in a recent *Rolling Stone* has made clear, this will make climate deformation and our doom irreversible. On top of all this, we have an unbearable and incomprehensible political stalemate fueled by elite denial, greed and betrayal of trust.

HOPE – THROUGH ACTION

But whether young, old, or in the middle of your years, you dear reader and writer for *Green Horizon* have not turned away from facing squarely the question, “Suppose we don’t make it?” You have not imbibed the narcotic, you have not fallen into spectatoritis.

The biggest reason for that is this: you take action. Action is a great healer and source of problem-solving power.

We offer in this issue illustrative examples of action taken by people like you and me, people who have not given up but are pioneers of resistance, pioneers of a new politics, and pioneers of a new society. The examples are representative of what is going on all over the world. People are taking similar actions by millions. None of us knows this, of course, for we are kept ignorant of what others are doing. A cowardly corporate elite

JOHN RENSENBRINK

*Suddenly, out of the blue,
you find yourself face to face
with the unthinkable and
unspeakable question,
“suppose we don’t make it?”
And the question will
not go away.*

*We offer in this issue
illustrative examples of
action taken by people like
you and me, people who have
not given up but are pioneers
of resistance, pioneers of a
new politics, and pioneers
of a new society.*

“shields” us from the knowledge. As already Aristotle pointed out, a tyrant reveals his tyranny most clearly by keeping the people separate from one another and fearful of one another. But action is taking place.

Do you feel that you are not taking action and feel awkward because of it? Think again. I have a strong feeling that everyone who gets and reads our magazine, in some part of their lives, is taking action to save the world. If you are very old and infirm, or if you are saddled with illness, or if poverty makes it impossible to act, be comforted. What I mean by taking action includes and starts with the action of the soul itself. Where your soul cries out to say, “We shall not be moved”, there lies the very core and substance, the very soul-substance, of action. For the soul radiates outward the unbelievable and stubborn will to live and persevere.

WHAT'S IN THIS ISSUE?

I start us out by giving us a glimpse of the very remarkable campaign for president by Jill Stein and her running mate Cheri Honkala. Hers is a stunning example of action, a beacon of hope and inspiration, and a herald of great campaigns to come. Read it and love it. And love her.

There follows a letter to his grandchildren by my colleague in this *Green Horizon* endeavor, Steve Welzer. I have, over the years, learned of other people who've come of age who are sending a message to their heirs. A great action.

In the articles that follow Steve's, Brian Kent and Maynard Kaufman write about living on the land in the way people are meant to live on the land. Their action is mirrored in thousands, if not millions, of actions of a similar kind taken throughout the planet.

A major part of the theme is finding and practicing feasible alternatives to the fossil-fuel industry in agriculture, industry, neighborhood and urban living, and grass roots-managed economy in general. David Schwartzman's article provides hardy technical evidence that solar power is a feasible foundation for a new and democratic economy. He and his son Peter Schwartzman have probed and researched the question of a fully adequate healthy alternative to the unhealthy, community-destructive, and planet wrecking jihad of the fossil-fuel industry and its unholy and tyrannical political grip on our future.

GREEN PARTY ACTION

Mark Satin's article leads off. His evocation and description of the founding of the Green Party rooted in Ten Key Values is exciting and timely. Out of the bits and pieces of many ideas and interests, some of them initially totally at odds with one another, came a Statement that has anchored and inspired a promising third party for over 25 years, and counting. Writing from direct experience working with Charlene Spretak to initiate and nurture the genesis of the Ten Key Values, Mark's story is especially apt right now as Greens take renewed devotion to making those values live in our politics.

Living those values in our politics is what Pam Hartwell-Herero describes she and her innovative colleagues are doing as members of the governing Council (Pam as Mayor) of Fairfax, California. Their successful grass roots efforts can and will be emulated by hundreds if not thousands of local jurisdictions in the coming years. They are part of a revolution that is going on under the radar screen of the established media.

Kat Williams galvanized a Workshop at the national Green Party Convention in Baltimore in early July. The standing-room-only Workshop became a vivid discussion of the “Proposed Open Letter to the American People (a draft of which appeared in the last issue of this magazine, Spring/Summer 2012.) Kat's speech, reproduced in this issue, was a challenge to the Workshop participants to make Green Party values and practical positions on issues alive and known to the people in the streets, public halls and homes throughout the country.

Two articles complete the ensemble of presentations in this issue. Both identify dedicated Green Party developments in countries other than the United States. Ralph Mono's essay on the start and evolution of the Sweden's Green Party is an absorbing tale. As you read it, you will see that the issues of party building and the Green Party's relation to power and to the ideal of transforming society are the issues facing Green Parties throughout the world. Ralph, in addition to his wide and deep experience in Green Party work in Sweden and in Europe, was a critical figure in the 1990's in helping the U.S. Green Party grow at a difficult time in its trajectory.

The Green Party news from Japan is noteworthy. After struggling for many years, Japanese Greens have reached a point of unity and confidence. Richard Evanoff describes their successful action this summer to form a strong Green Party of Japan.

Dear friends and neighbors, we are in a great twilight struggle to rescue our communities, our nation, and our planet from desperate ruin. We need to know each other, we need to know that others are taking action, we need to know that together “we shall not be moved, just like a tree that's planted by the water, we shall not be moved.” A new day IS possible. Together, through action, we become the revolution.

— JR



JOHN RENSENBRINK

is co-editor of *Green Horizon Magazine*. He helped found the U.S. Green Party and the Maine Green Independent Party and remains active in both parties. Among his books is *Against All Odds, the Green transformation of American politics*. He is professor emeritus of Government and Legal Studies at Bowdoin College and lives

with his wife Carla in Topsham, Maine.

JILL STEIN'S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN MESSAGE

for the American People

Editor's Note: Jill Stein was interviewed by Yana Kunichoff of Truthout on August 7, 2012. Several of their exchanges provide a useful and succinct portrayal of Jill Stein's message to the American people in her campaign for president of the United States. I have added (interpolated) pertinent statements by her gleaned from her website and from conversations with her during her visit to Maine on Labor Day weekend. (<http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/10685-interview-with-jill-stein-candidate-for-organizer-in-chief>)

Yana Kunichoff asked: "You have been running your campaign both at the grassroots level and the electoral level. Tell me about bringing those two together."

Jill responded: "It's about bringing a clear electoral focus into the fight that's going on at the grassroots level, for our homes, for jobs, for affordable healthcare, and for tuitions that a student can afford. These fights are actively going on in our communities, but they are not currently represented in electoral politics. They are not on the horizon of two major parties, they are busy talking about Mitt Romney's tax forms or latest gaffes, anything but the real problems that Americans are struggling with and how we are going to fix them.

"Bringing the grassroots struggle into electoral politics and challenging the hijack of our electoral system gives me the liberty to talk about what we need and how we are going to fix these things. *We need a truly green economy if we are going to survive.* The public is aware that we need to bring the troops home now. It's so exciting to me that there is a kind of real focusing now on the public voice, and the public mindset. It's very exciting to be able to provide a political vehicle for that consensus."

"Bring the grassroots struggle into electoral politics" is a central theme in Jill Stein's campaign. On Labor Day, she issued a statement in which she recalled the Economic Bill of Rights that Franklin Delano Roosevelt called for during the last year of his presidency. This was in 1944. Included in the Economic Bill of Rights were the right to a job, to a living wage, to have effective labor unions, to have clear and protected voting rights, to health care, to education, and to retirement security.

Strongly affirming the Economic Bill of Rights, Jill continues, "Imagine if Labor had spent over \$15 Billion they spent on the Democrats over the last 40 years, building instead an independent labor party and movement, the two corporate parties would no longer monopolize U.S. politics. Democrats like Obama would not dare to force new so called free trade treaties upon workers." This is from Jill's website.

Back to Yana Kunichoff's questions:

ISSUES FACING STUDENTS AND YOUNG PEOPLE GENERALLY

When Yana asked about student debt, Jill said, "This election is a whole new ball game. I've run for office several times and have always heard the complaints about 'Oh third parties how dare you.' I've expected it to be really intense and bitter but in many places it's been the opposite. This race has at times been really like giving out candy at

Bringing the grassroots struggle into electoral politics and challenging the hijack of our electoral system gives me the liberty to talk about what we need and how we are going to fix these things. We need a truly green economy if we are going to survive.

Hanukah or Christmas or Kwanza, like at Western Illinois University, the students were just overjoyed not to have to vote for a candidate who said they don't count. Both Obama and Romney promised to stay the course on student debt. Students are not in a survival position, there are 36 million students that are basically in indentured servitude so that our state governments can give handouts to corporations.

"On top of that students have a climate catastrophe to look forward to, and the President has regrettably embraced "drill, baby drill." He has undermined the next set of climate accords and promised that we won't do anything about this until 2020. They are in a similar position in many ways to that of young people in Egypt and Tunisia. What if American college students get wind that they actually have a choice? We are experiencing this on college after college where young people in particular are getting on Facebook and leading the expanding Stein presidential campaign.

"It's not just young people, we hear from dissidents in the labor movement who also are growing weary with the complicity of organized labor. You see breakaway labor movements like in Chicago where the Teachers Union is not going to let their democratic mayor just slash their wages and their benefits, even in election season. And then there is the issue of our civil liberties where President Obama took the violations of George Bush, codified them, and then went even further to legalize the violations of our civil liberties."

THE PRESIDENT AS ORGANIZER-IN-CHIEF

Yana then asked: "If you became president, you'd inherit a massive national security state complete with widespread surveillance mechanisms and a secretive immigration bureaucracy. How would you deal with this?"

Jill replied: It's clear that the current congress doesn't work and Washington is in gridlock. There is nowhere to go but up. They are in a state of dysfunction. So a lot of things would change. First of all, if I were to get elected, I would have a mandate for a real agenda. So that puts us in a great position of advantage relative to what Democrats and Republicans are doing now: talking about nothing and trying to win the race based on being the anti.

"How would we work? I want to mention what happened around the SOPA [Stop Online Piracy Act] bill and the PIPA [Protect IP Act] bill, which was considered a slam dunk. It was commonly thought that it was going to pass, the press wasn't even talking about it. But the public got wind about something that really mattered, so it got out there on the internet and people stopped it on a dime. That should be the rule and not the exception. Presidents have considerable power—if they so choose—to be the organizer in chief. They can ensure that people know about critical bills that are coming up—helping them and urging them to call their elected officials. A president can engage the people to be the real engine of our democracy. What if democracy actually worked? Right now, we don't have a functioning democracy."

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Yana wanted specifics about the "Green New Deal". Jill replied, "The Green New Deal is an emergency plan based on the New Deal that has a track record. It substantially got us out of the depression and our plan is modeled on that. It would create 25 million jobs, community jobs and living wage jobs at the same time that it jumpstarts the green economy that can make wars for oil obsolete because it meets our energy needs here at home. It would not be a Washington driven cookie cutter program, but a bottom up program that puts communities in charge of finding what jobs they need in order to be sustainable.

"On the social side we would see communities also hiring back their teachers, the 300,000 teachers that were laid off, as well as positions in childcare and violence prevention. It would include jobs in the public sector so people could go down to an employment office instead of an unemployment office and collect a check for working a job that helps your community. It would also include jump starting small businesses and worker cooperatives, particularly helping innovators in both of those departments. The small business enterprises that truly are the job creators, unlike the multinational so-called creators, have suffered enormously from the monopolies held by multinationals.

"The cost of these programs have been estimated, there are various models. The main program we look at was a model created by Philip Harvey at Rutgers Law School. His plan calls for a program that costs less than the President's first stimulus package. It directly creates jobs—whereas President Obama's called for tax cuts for corporations. The Green New Deal contains financial reform to ensure that financing is available. It would break up the big banks that have only gotten bigger and bigger. We would reform the banking system. We would implement a Wall Street transaction tax, tax Wall Street gains as income. There would also be the money coming in with the downsizing of the military."

VIOLENCE AND RACISM

Yana asked: "One issue that both Romney and Obama have been conspicuously silent on is the recent police violence in Anaheim and police shootings more generally."

Jill exclaimed: "It's unconscionable, and the police violence has its mirror in civilian violence as well, including the sort of paramilitary violence. I'm thinking here of Trayvon Martin as well as Kenneth Chamberlain, who is really a staggering poster child of violence. There is a thread here that weaves between racist violence, random crazy person violence and police violence, there is just a whole spectrum of violence here where racism plays a very strong role.

It's clear that we need to rein in police violence, we need to hold police forces accountable, the stop and frisk program in New York City which is all about racial profiling too, we need to put an end to racial profiling, they do not make us safer and are inherently violent and degrading. In addition, we need to insure that we are addressing economic violence that plays out racially in its fullest extreme to whereas African-American families

had 10 cents on the dollars to the Caucasians 10 years ago, they now have 5 cents on the dollar. It's really important for people to acknowledge the institutional racism that is built into the functioning of our society. We need to talk about this so we can understand how tilted of a playing field we are on. We are not in a post racial era, these problems are very big and they are only getting worse. We have go to fix them, and part of this is having an honest conversation and addressing the economic need, particularly in communities of color."

HOW ABOUT THE PRESSURE TO VOTE OBAMA IN SPITE OF ALL?

Yana closed with this question: "As we get closer and closer to the election, the pressure for progressives to vote for Obama is going to increase. What would you like to say to potential voters?"

Jill said: It's really important to see where the politics of fear has gotten us. George Bush bailed out Wall Street, Barack Obama bailed our Wall Street. That didn't get better. George Bush deported a lot of immigrants, Obama deported a whole lot more immigrants. Because we were quiet our civil liberties have been trashed even more. It's really important to say that under the Democrats the ship won't go down quite as fast, but a sinking ship is still a sinking ship. Your objective is not to get onto another ship which is going down a little bit less quickly, this doesn't get us out of there alive.

"Neither Democrats nor Republicans are offering strategies for the crisis we are in, none of them have an exit strategy and yet Democrats are asking us won't we please use our votes as weapons against ourselves? Our successes historically have always come from a social movement on the ground. It's time to stand with the politics of courage, not fear, and take our political life back from our political abusers.

It happened in Egypt and Tunisia, and they had a much bigger hill to climb. I think we have already won the hard battle, which is for the hearts and minds of the American public - they have checked out from establishment politics. It doesn't end in November. By launching a new voice, by political courage, there is no going home. It's about engaging the battle that has already come to our streets."

Along those lines, Jill refers frequently to what Alice Walker, a widely read Black writer, has said, "The biggest way people give up their power is by not knowing they have it to start with." Jill follows up, "And that's true, for the environmental movement, the student movement, the anti-war movement, the health-care-as-a-human right movement, and as a labor movement, you put us all together we have the potential for a Tahrir Square type event and a Tunisian event, [to] turn the White House into a Green House in November."



JILL STEIN AND CHERI HONKALA:
GREEN PARTY CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES, 2012.

Jill is an American physician and teacher of internal medicine. She ran for Governor of Massachusetts in 2002 and 2010. She lives in Lexington, Massachusetts. She serves on the Boards of Greater Boston Physicians for Social Responsibility and Mass Voters for Fair Elections.



Cheri Honkala is an anti-poverty advocate, lives in Philadelphia where she ran for Sheriff in 2011. She is co-founder of the Kensington Welfare Rights Union as well as National Coordinator (and founder) of the Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign.

Saving the Earth, continued from page 18

How can we begin this ecological restoration? First, we must get informed. A good source of information is the book that Tom Small, a retired English professor, published last year: *Using Native Plants to Restore Community*. It is a beautiful book full of practical advice. Tom, and his wife Nancy, recently deceased, organized the Kalamazoo Area Chapter of The Wild Ones which is dedicated to the promotion of native plants. Several states have chapters of The Wild Ones.

Another book I found very helpful was written by Douglas Tallamy, a professor of entomology, and his studies of insect and plant interactions demonstrate the importance of providing more native plants that insects can digest. His book is entitled *Bringing Nature Home: How you can Sustain Wildlife with Native Plants*.

As the importance of native plants catches on they are becoming widely available through commercial sources. It is, however, important to be sure they are native in your local area. Many County Conservation Districts make native wildflowers,

bushes and trees available at their spring sales. It is also important to recognize that we can not count on government programs to restore native plants because most of the land available for native plants is owned and controlled by rural or suburban residents. As we face a changing climate, which adds new threats to biodiversity, we can help to preserve species with more native plants.



MAYNARD KAUFMAN

As an organic farmer and gardener, Maynard Kaufman had been so focused on raising plants for human food that it took him a long time to realize that we must also provide food for our insect friends. Now that he is moving into his mid-eighties he has finally begun replacing parts of his lawn with native plants. He also advises a

Transition Initiative in southwest Michigan.

THOUGHTS For My Grandchildren

...on *What You'll be Facing*

STEVE WELZER

This is the first in a planned series of articles by Steve Welzer

It may be your generation that says "enough" in regard to quite a few of the things that have characterized the human project of late.

I think you'll be living through special times.

I hope that you won't be among the complacent. Because the reality you'll be facing is sure to be disconcerting for the complacent.

The world of people is not quite the same as the world of life.

*It's narrower.
And it's harder.*

DEAR GRANDCHILDREN:

You're not even old enough to read yet, but I'm such a slow writer that I think I better start now to put down the thoughts I want to convey to you. If I remember correctly, trying to think back, I believe it's around the age of 16 or 17 that adolescents start to tune in to adult conversations about "life" and "the world" and "serious things." So I'll take my time formulating my thoughts as I enjoy watching you grow.

Surely, in what seems to me to be the long, strange trip of my Life, I must have learned something that you'll find a little interesting or a little valuable. In any case, by the time I present you with these notebooks I'm confident we'll still be loving each other so much that you'll be inclined to humor me and at least give my rummagings a look-over.

I wish you all the very best in life. And there are many good things. Last year Grammy and I gave you the set of *My Book House* volumes that her parents gave to her when she was your age. Twelve volumes to engage you as you grow, from "Story Time" to "In the Nursery" to "The Treasure Chest" to "Halls of Fame." A treasure, indeed. When we read them to you it's clear (to us) that they come from another time... a quieter time; a more optimistic time. The first entry is a tiny poem by Robert Louis Stevenson:

The world is so full
Of a number of things,
I'm sure we should all
Be as happy as kings.

Just as I said! Many good things — sensations and experiences and wonders. But... Well, there are a lot of buts. We'll leave that to later.

All of you will be fully creatures of the 21st century. Having been born so early in it, you'll identify with it and hopefully you'll see most of it unfold. There are the usual "visionaries" right now predicting that unbelievable breakthroughs in science and medicine will enable members of your generation to live well past 100 and so into the 22nd century. I'm doubtful. In fact, it may be your generation that finally says "enough" regarding the

preoccupation with life-extension. Already, now, too many people are suffering too much through too many decades of old age.

In fact, it may be your generation that says “enough” in regard to quite a few of the things that have characterized the human project of late. My writing that should give you a sense that I think you’ll be living through special times. That’s indeed the case and it will be a major theme of these notebooks.

You’ll take a road trip or two (or two hundred!) in your lifetime and you’ll see maps along the highways with a little red arrow: “You Are Here.” I want to try to give you an orientation like that vis-a-vis the expanse of human history. My time-map, though, won’t be able to give you specific directions regarding the question “Where To Go From Here.” You’ll have to discover that by yourselves.

Many around you will fail to even consider the question. Your peer group will be middle class Americans of the 21st century and I’m willing to bet that you’ll find a lot of complacency among them. You and they will notice signs of decline and deterioration around you. Such will likely be a topic of conversation, but I don’t think the decline will cause you much in the way of suffering, and most of your peers will hardly react.

America has been very well off for a very long time. And things don’t change all so fast. The wealth that this country built up over the period of its first two hundred years of existence (three hundred years if we extend our scope back into the colonial period) was unprecedented — almost unbelievable. It’s dissipating now, but not all so fast.

In your time, as in mine, it will continue to seem as if many of the problems needing attention are more of surfeit than of scarcity. For the sake of your own happiness, your personal life-satisfaction, I hope that you won’t be among the complacent. Because the reality you’ll be facing is sure to be disconcerting for the complacent...characterized by scarcities very subtle but very deep.

Many of my own generation were disconcerted when the original stories conveyed to us about our circumstances of life turned out to be misleading, or worse. The disillusion was painful. I guess one of my motivations is to spare you that. Maybe what I can convey to you about these times will help orient you, ground you...even console you.

Or maybe that’s just another delusion on my part. Maybe the ideas of one generation can’t be fully conveyed in the language of the next.

I’m hoping that love transcends language. I’m trusting that meaning is universal.

Anyway, let’s begin.

You’re now in your very early years, and so you’re open to a broad world of sensations, feelings, and energies. It’s the world of life. I love to be with you, to play and run with you, to see things through your eyes. You help me to remember the vividness... the colors and sounds of the world of life.

As you grow you’ll be ushered into a special world — the world of people. It’s not quite the same as the world of life. It’s narrower. And it’s harder.

“Special” might sound like good news, but it’s not necessarily. We’re going to be talking about the inherent specialness of the human condition, on the one hand, and the problematic specialness of the times we’re living through, on the other. You need to know about both.

They’re related. They’re both major factors in our lives. But people have a tendency to get them mixed up...as if the problems of the times are unavoidable due to “human nature.” You’ll hear people say: “Things have always been this way and always will be.” But that’s not true.

I said something before about wanting to “spare you.” This is actually a common feeling, on some level (sometimes “under the surface”) among parents and grandparents. There was a book written during the middle part of the last century that was a phenomenon in many ways. *The Catcher in the Rye* was a big best-seller and its author became renowned, but one aspect of the phenomenon centered around a question: Why did the book have such widespread appeal? It was not all so well written, it had little in the way of plot or mystery or drama. It was not uplifting or particularly inspiring. I think the answer to the question has to do with the chord it strikes relating to deep feelings we all have about the process of becoming human, the process of “growing up”...especially in our culture, especially in these times.

The protagonist of the book wanted to save the children. From what? He sensed something wrong in the world of people, but he couldn’t quite comprehend it. He, like many, wasn’t able to separate out the general human challenges that every person, generation, and culture must face up to from the specific problems of modern times, problems that need to be resolved.

Much thinking has been done since then about these very important issues. What I can explain to you has been made possible by the work of many insightful people in fields as diverse as anthropology, sociology, psychology, biology, and even political science. Literature and poetry, too. We’ll delve into these ideas as we try to situate you and your prospective experiences on the time-map we’ll be developing.

...to be continued



STEVE WELZER

a co-editor of this magazine, has been a Green movement activist for over twenty years. He was a founding member of the Green Party of New Jersey in 1997 and currently serves on the Steering Committee of the Green Party of the United States.

Steve holds a Masters degree in Economics from Rutgers University. He lives in East Windsor, New Jersey, and is pursuing a project to establish an ecovillage in that state.

A RAPID SOLAR TRANSITION

Not only Possible, it is Imperative!

DAVID SCHWARTZMAN

THE THREAT OF CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE

Humanity and nature face two technological threats of unprecedented magnitude. Daunting obstacles stand in the way of removing these threats. But paradoxically, by overcoming these obstacles, we can realize the vision of “another world is possible”—the rallying cry of the 15,000 strong Social Forum participants in Detroit in 2010.

The first technological threat is the continuing and foreboding threat of nuclear war. Though not inevitable, it is deadly. The second threat is catastrophic climate change (C3). This is very likely inevitable if carbon emissions to the atmosphere are not rapidly and radically reduced—and the already unsafe atmospheric level of CO₂ is not reduced by sequestration technologies to below 350 ppm.

An unprecedented path to the “other world that is possible” will be opened up if humanity succeeds in the near future in overcoming the obstacles standing in the way of decarbonizing global energy supplies, and couples this with rapid implementation of state-of-the-science solar technologies such as wind, concentrated solar power and photovoltaics.

The obstacles are NOT technological. Rather, they lie in the political economy of real existing 21st Century global Capitalism, starting with *the Military Industrial (Fossil Fuel, Nuclear, State Terror) Complex*. *A transnational movement for peace and justice must put this Dinosaur in the Museum of Prehistory where it belongs.*

There are three critical requirements for that “other world that is possible”: global demilitarization, agroecologies replacing industrial/GMO agriculture, and the creation of high-efficiency solar power replacing unsustainable energy (fossil fuels/nuclear power). Expanding democratic, bottom-up management of this transition is necessary to achieve these goals. We may have only 5 years left to begin radical cuts in carbon emissions.¹ Otherwise we face the likelihood of reaching tipping points to C3, including irreversible melting of Arctic sea ice/Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets with several meters rise in global sea level by 2100, widespread ecosystem collapse, alpine water supply disappearance, dangerous ocean acidification, catastrophic climate extremes (flooding, droughts, storm damage).^{5,6}

IS A RAPID AND ROBUST SOLAR TRANSITION TECHNICALLY POSSIBLE? HOW MUCH ENERGY DOES HUMANITY REALLY NEED?

My older son Peter Schwartzman and I modeled global solar transition using values for the Energy Return Over Energy Invested for state-of-the-science wind/solar technologies, “EROEI”, i.e., how much energy does the technology such as a wind turbine generate in its usable lifetime divided by the energy needed to construct and maintain it. To our knowledge this was the first study which computed the necessary non-renewable energy needed to create the renewable capacity in a solar transition scenario.²

Mainly because of its lower carbon emission footprint compared to coal, the preferred fossil fuel to make a solar transition is conventional petroleum (oil and natural gas, *excluding* the higher carbon footprint tar sands/fracked natural gas). We estimate that a robust solar transition can be completed in 20-30 years using no more than 40% of

A robust solar transition is possible requiring a few decades, with the potential of avoiding irreversible tipping points...

proven conventional petroleum reserves. The latter requirement will be reduced as higher EROEI wind/solar technologies are developed.

At the culmination of this solar transition a *global increase* in energy would be delivered to the world, with many countries in the global North such as the U.S. decreasing their wasteful consumption. But most of humanity, living in the global South, would receive a significant increase, reaching the rough minimum of 3.5 kilowatt/person required for state-of-the-science life expectancy levels. The 3.5 kilowatt/person is necessary but not sufficient for acquiring the highest life expectancy. Several petroleum-exporting countries with high energy consumption/person in the Mideast and Russia fall well below this value. U.S. life expectancy is likewise below most industrial countries of the global North. Income inequality is robustly correlated with bad health and must be reduced to achieve the world standard life expectancy/quality of life.³ Supplying the minimum 3.5 kilowatt/person for the present world population of 7 billion people requires delivering 25 Tera Watts, with the present delivery of 16 Tera Watts.² Tera is trillion. Note that power = energy/time, therefore the present annual global energy consumption is 16 Tera Watt Years (<http://solarutopia.info/2012/08/living-long-and-having-access-to-energy>).

The solar transition must be parasitic on existing energy supplies, just as the industrial fossil fuel revolution was parasitic on biomass energy until coal reproduced itself. Early and rapid phase-out of coal use and aggressive energy conservation in energy-wasteful countries (e.g., U.S.) are imperative in order to begin radical reduction in carbon emissions. Further, energy conservation in the global North would free up petroleum needed for rapid solar development in the global South. Oil-rich countries in the Mideast, South America (e.g., Venezuela) and Europe (e.g., Russia) will be valuable partners in this solar transition by providing the needed petroleum. There is little doubt that this transition will require global demilitarization as a necessary condition for a global cooperative regime. If this transition is delayed then humanity will face the virtually inevitable onset of C3. The higher the EROEI of wind/solar technology used, the less unsustainable presently-used-energy is needed for transition.

A LIKELY MAXIMUM OF 40% OF PROVEN CONVENTIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVES IS NEEDED IF A ROBUST SOLAR TRANSITION STARTS VERY SOON.

We posit a conservative value of EROEI = 20 for wind/solar, twice the current global energy delivery, roughly 32 Tera Watts, corresponding to 9 billion people, is generated for a 20-30 year solar transition with the complete termination of fossil fuel/nuclear/biofuels. In order to ensure a steadily growing global supply of energy, conventional petroleum will provide the complementary supply to the growing wind/solar delivery, with a progressive decrease to zero at the end of the transition. We estimate that no more than 40% of the proven conventional

reserves of petroleum is needed. The latter requirement will be reduced as higher EROEI wind and solar technologies are developed. In addition, coal, nuclear power, as well as hydropower and biofuels with significant carbon footprints, can contribute to RE creation before being phased out completely in the early phase of the transition. Thus, the 40% of petroleum reserves needed as a backup is a likely maximum.²

If a vigorous solar transition is delayed too long, then we face a virtually inevitable onset of C3, barring the near future revolutionary solar technologies with much higher EROEI values. Nevertheless, carbon sequestration powered by agroecologies and solar power is imperative, and must start asap to have any hope of preventing the C3. The longer the excess carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere the more likely the tipping points for C3 will be reached, therefore radical and early cuts in carbon emissions and carbon sequestration should go hand-in-hand.

IS THE BASELOAD SUPPLY OF ENERGY AN OBSTACLE FOR WIND/SOLAR?

Baseload is the backup supply of energy when a particular energy technology is not operating at full capacity. Commonly, supporters of continued reliance on fossil fuels and/or nuclear power raise the misleading objection that wind/solar cannot meet the challenge of baseload. Available storage technologies will facilitate the expansion of these renewables. However, a big enough array of turbines, especially offshore, can generate a baseload without the need to supplement it with separate storage systems.⁵ Further, the progressive expansion of combined wind, photovoltaics, and concentrated solar power in deserts will generate a baseload simply because the wind is blowing or the sun is shining somewhere in the system linked to one grid. Meanwhile baseload would be backed up by petroleum, on the way to a full solar transition.

CARBON-SEQUESTRATION?

Carbon-sequestration from the atmosphere is imperative, and must start in the near future since the longer the excess carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere the more likely the tipping points for C3 will be reached. Only the thermal inertia of the oceans responding to the now unsafe (400 ppm) and ever rising atmospheric level of CO₂ gives us a short window of opportunity. A prevention program to have any chance of avoiding C3 must include carbon-sequestration from the atmosphere to achieve an atmospheric CO₂ level at or below 350 ppm asap.⁶ A recent study recommends a 6% cut/year in fossil fuel consumption starting now, with 100 Pg of carbon sequestered from the atmosphere by reforestation from 2031-2080 leaving 350 ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere by 2100.⁷ We estimate that a combination of global agroecologies, increasing soil carbon storage, and solar-powered-industrial-carbon-sequestration from the atmosphere, burying carbonate in the crust (not “clean coal”!) has the capacity of reaching the 350 ppm limit by 2050 if implementation starts very soon.

The convergence of the economic, social and ecological/climate crises makes a rapid transition to wind/solar power imperative, hence a Global Green New Deal must be on the agenda.

GROWTH OR DEGROWTH?

The degrowth movement is gaining support in Europe. Richard Heinberg is an influential champion of the Transition City movement. Here is a sample of his argument:

“there is no credible scenario in which alternative energy sources can entirely make up for fossil fuels as the latter deplete. The overwhelming likelihood is that, by 2100, global society will have less energy available for economic purposes, not more...A full replacement of energy currently derived from fossil fuels with energy from alternative sources is probably impossible over the short term; it may be unrealistic to expect it even over longer time frames... Fossil fuel supplies will almost surely decline faster than alternatives can be developed to replace them...we believe that the world has reached immediate, non-negotiable energy limits to growth.”⁸

Au contraire, we show that a complete global transition to wind/solar energy is possible using current technology taking 20-30 years. Richard Heinberg’s prescription would doom most of humanity to a future of living hell since *global* energy supplies must be increased to end energy poverty in the global South as well as create the capacity for carbon sequestration from the atmosphere and for the massive cleanup of the biosphere. Nevertheless, while degrowth is a very problematic recipe for global restructuring, it should not be dismissed as a useless response to the unsustainable reproduction of capital, with a reduction in certain kinds of consumption necessary especially in the global North and for elites in the global South. Thus arguments for degrowth should be taken seriously insofar as they address economic activities that increase consumption of fossil fuels, especially coal and tar sands, the two most intense carbon emitters.

The degrowth program is highly problematic because of its failure to analyze the qualitative aspects of economic growth and

its emphasis on the local economy without recognizing the urgency to address global anthropogenic change from a transnational political perspective. This demands struggle on all spatial scales, from the neighborhood to the globe.

Global degrowth fails to come to terms with qualitative versus quantitative aspects of economic growth. Further, the energy base of the global physical economy is critical: global wind/solar power will pay its “entropic debt” to space as non-incremental waste heat, unlike its unsustainable alternatives. The concept of economic growth should be deconstructed, particularly with respect to ecological and health impacts. Growth of what are we speaking, weapons of mass destruction, unnecessary commodities, SUVs versus bicycles, culture, information, pollution, pornography, or simply more hot air? Instead, degrowthers commonly lump all growth into a homogenous outcome of the physical and political economy.

A Global Green New Deal (GGND) will deliver sustainable growth with huge benefits for both humans and nature, with clean air and water, organic food, meaningful employment and more free creative time for all on this planet.⁹ Green sustainable growth will be a transition to a steady-state global solar economy in the 21st Century. Further, the GGND will create the social and material base for bottom-up democratic management of the political and physical economies while still having a chance to prevent C3. Hence, Jill Stein’s focus on the GND is very timely!

The political requirement for realizing the “other world that is possible” is transnational, multidimensional class struggle. Class struggle in the 21st Century transcends the narrower conceptions of the 19th and 20th Centuries centered around the activity of the industrial working class. 21st Century class struggle encompasses the creative activity of the 99%. It is profoundly democratic, aimed at expanding democracy to all spheres, political, economic and social, bringing into full reality the rights spelled out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequent treaties for all humankind. The rule of the 1% (more accurately the 0.1%) is obsolete and a continuing threat to human civilization

A likely maximum of 40% of proven conventional petroleum reserves is needed if a robust solar transition starts very soon.

and biodiversity. This rule must be terminated, with the 1% joining the rest of us in the “other world that is possible”.

Transnational/multidimensional class struggle for social governance of production and consumption on all scales, neighborhood to global includes the following agenda:

- Publicly owned/accountable banks
- Municipalization of electric and water supplies
- Reconversion of MIC to the Green Clean Energy physical economy, including Green Cities
- Nationalization of energy, rail, and telecommunications industries
- Compulsory licensing of state-of-the science wind/solar/information technologies, making them freely available globally, following the precedent provided in the U.S. Clean Air Act
- Creation of decentralized solar power, food, energy, farming cooperatives and worker-owned factories (“solidarity economy”)
- Replacement of industrial/GMO agriculture with agro-ecologies
- Organizing the unorganized in all sectors, especially GGND workers.

This is a transition to America beyond Capitalism, yes the World beyond Capitalism.¹⁰

CONCLUSION

A robust solar transition is possible requiring a few decades, with the potential of avoiding irreversible tipping points. Simultaneously, energy poverty in the global South could be ended, thereby meeting a necessary condition for the state-of-the-science quality of life for all of humanity. The convergence of the economic, social and ecological/climate crises makes a rapid transition to wind/solar power imperative, hence a Global Green New Deal must be on the agenda for implementation in the very near future.

ENDNOTES

1. Harvey F (November 9, 2011) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>.
2. www.solarutopia.org. Schwartzman P & Schwartzman D (2011) A Solar Transition is Possible.: originally posted at <http://iprd.org.uk>. In our model, the critical factor that leads to exponential growth of renewable energy supply is the feedback of energy from the growing renewable capacity back into the physical economy to create more of itself. State of the science values of EROEI: Wind turbines: 20 to 75; Photovoltaics: 6 to >10; CSP: 7 to 40.
3. Wilkinson R & Pickett K (2009) *The Spirit Level Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. Penguin Books. London. Kawachi I & Kennedy BP (2006) *The Health of Nations: Why Inequality Is Harmful to Your Health*. The New Press. New York.
4. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.USE.PCAP.KG.OE>, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_life_expectancy.
5. Archer CL & Jacobson MZ (2007) *J. Applied Meteorol. and Climatology* 46, 1701-1717, www.stanford.edu/group/efmh/winds. Kempton W et al,=. (2010) *PNAS* 107: 7240-7245.
6. Hansen J et sl. (2008) *Open Atmos. Sci. J.*, 2, 217-231.
7. Hansen J et al. (2011) *The Case for Young People and Nature: A Path to a Healthy, Natural, Prosperous Future*. <http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/>.
8. Quotation posted from Heinberg R (2009) *Searching for a Miracle: Net Energy Limits and the Fate of Industrial Societies*. International Forum on Globalization and Post Carbon Institute. <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/254838-earth-s-limits-why-growth-won-t-return>. Also see: Heinberg R (2011) *The End of Growth*. New Society Publishers. British Columbia, Canada.
9. Schwartzman D (2011) *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 22, (3) 49-56.
10. Alperovitz G (2011) *America beyond Capitalism*. Democracy Collaborative Press, Takoma Park, Maryland. Gar Alperovitz gave the brilliant keynote to the Green Party of the United States National Convention, July 14, 2012: <http://www.democracynow.org/shows/2012/7/16>



DAVID SCHWARTZMAN

is Professor Emeritus, Department of Biology, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20059, United States, Member of the International Committee of the Green Party of the United States. Activist and candidate for US Senator, DC Statehood Green Party. E-mail: dschwartzman@gmail.com

BACK TO THE LAND, TOO

Two Generations Living Lightly on the Land in Maine

BRIAN KENT

*Three criteria were paramount:
good soil, a place to stay,
and inexpensive land.
We could offer all three.*

*In the 1970s there was one
farmer's market in Maine.
Now there are 125. After
decades of decline the number
of Maine farms is now
increasing.*

Little did we think that 38 years after we settled on our wooded land on Oak Hill, in Maine, that a second wave of “new immigrants” or “back-to-the-landers” would follow.

Along the way we’ve thrived and learned a lot; now we find ourselves mentoring others while still living lightly on the land.

Looking back, our lifestyle might now be described as “green.” Back then, it was seen as a “hippie” or “granola” lifestyle. We simply see it as a sensible, rewarding, and a responsible way to live our lives.

MAINE'S NEW IMMIGRANTS

The 1970s saw many young couples coming to Maine. Sociologists wrote about the “New Immigrants.” We were featured in the Sunday paper as “typical” newcomers. Perhaps so.

We bought 70 acres of woodland for \$13,000, built a small cabin, cleared land for fruit trees and a garden, and discovered the value of a chainsaw. In winter we burned too-green firewood and hiked or snowshoed ¼ mile to where the plows turned around. I found a state job. Janet kept the stoves burning in our modest 200-square-foot “starter” home. With a hand pump in the “kitchen” and kerosene for lamps, we were off on a wonderful adventure.

Janet grew up in steel-town, Gary, Indiana. I was born and schooled in South Africa. A United Nations’ scholarship brought me to the United States where I earned a Masters in architecture and urban design. Having traveled extensively in Europe and Africa, our stay-at-home adventure has been shaped by our travels, our backgrounds, and, in the seventies, *Whole Earth* publications that touted a simple life.

We rejected the consumerism of America and sought a simpler lifestyle. That meant defining our needs, living close to nature, and a “do-it-yourself” philosophy.

What could we do without? How much could we grow ourselves? How much income did we need? Was electrical service essential to our happiness? And, later, could we raise two children while living this “alternative” lifestyle?

CHOICES

The answers came with trial and error, conscious choices, budgets, successes and new found delights. The adventure had many rewards, and we are richer for it. And, healthier, too.

By living without many conventional modern conveniences we saved money for travel and built rewarding, unconventional structures, both practical and frivolous. We did all the building ourselves. The lists below show what we do without, today, and the “luxuries” we enjoy that have been added over the years. We are neither rich nor poor. But we are very content with the choices we’ve made.

Rich or poor?

- Outhouse
- No running water
- No outside electric service
- No fridge or AC
- No furnace or central heating system
- No insurance
- No TV
- No microwave
- No washing machine or dryer
- Wood fired hot tub
- Solar powered freezer
- 100 acres of woods, field, and stream
- Soap stone kitchen sink
- Two-story gazebo
- Labyrinth, stone walls, and sculpture
- Flower and vegetable gardens
- Stonewalled root cellar
- Solar power for lights and computer
- Greenhouse and guest cabin
- Barn and chicken house
- Large deck
- Waterfront
- Cross-country ski trails

Of course, we learned along the way. For example, our “modular” house, begun in 1974 and enlarged over 20 years to accommodate a growing family, is woefully energy inefficient by today’s standards. Yet, because it’s so small it only takes 4 cord of wood to heat. Furthermore we’ve added energy efficient features. Indeed, our energy, travel, and vehicle choices make a very small footprint. According to National Geographic’s online personal energy meter, we use 97% less energy than the national average

More importantly, we’re in touch with the seasons and beholden to the whims of nature. We’ve learned to grow our own food and slaughter our animals for lamb, beef, pork, and poultry; we harvest lumber and firewood in the woodlot; and recycle, conserve, and reuse – all while enjoying professional careers. I’ve been a full-time planning & design consultant. Janet has been a homemaker and part-time massage therapist.

I should hasten to add that we’re not self-sufficient. We grow what we can. The supermarket is 15 miles away, as is the laundromat, library, bank, and a food co-op to which we belong.

Our kids, Graham and Genevieve, have tolerated and reveled in their parents’ “different” lifestyle. With woods to roam, trees

to climb, animals to raise, and adventuresome friends to invite over, they were popular and athletic. Still are, away from home.

THE NEW BACK-TO-THE-LANDERS

Today the surprise is we’re not alone. A new generation of enterprising young people are settling in Maine with similar aspirations. Like us, they are seeking a simple, sustainable, lifestyle; unlike us, many are seeking to make a living off the land.

These second generation back-to-the-landers reject mainstream corporate America, market driven thinking, and hand-held screen technology, and a culture of celebrity. They are coming to Maine because of the state’s commitment to local (organic) foods, the availability of good farmland and an emphasis on the local economy. They believe what the Nearing’s wrote about in 1954 – “the good life” can be lived here.

But, it’s taken dedicated pioneers in Maine to help them on their journey back to the land. This year the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA) has placed 175 apprentices on Maine farms. Since 2005 that organization has trained 145 “journey-persons”; about 120 are now farming. In the 1970s there was one farmer’s market in Maine. Now there are 125. After decades of decline, the number of Maine farms is now increasing.

Furthermore, the Maine Farmland Trust (MFT) (in partnership with MOFGA) has established a “Farmlink” program that puts aspiring farmers in touch with older farmers who seek help and can offer land for lease or lease/purchase. MFT’s “buy, protect, sell” program also helps. Working with farmers wanting to retire, MFT places permanent easements on their farms (or buys them) to prevent development, and then finds one or more young couples to steward the land on affordable terms. “Land for Good” does similar work throughout New England.

None of this was available to the pioneer back-to-the-landers. The networking now possible, online, has made it easier for the new generation, as has the local fresh food markets, the success of CSA’s (Community Supported Agriculture) and much improved food storage and distribution systems.

One retired farmer in Bowdoinham, Maine has 14 new farmers farming portions of his land, independently and successfully. With hoop houses to extend Maine’s short growing season they are selling their produce to mainstream food stores and more and more fine restaurants whose chefs demand fresh, local products.

LAND STEWARDS

On Oak Hill, two 30 year-olds are reinvigorating our small holding. Looking to find someone to continue to steward our land, as we aged, we contacted MFT’s Farmlink program. Likely candidates called, emailed, and visited. Some were dreamers, but most were serious-minded with specific goals backed by experience working on farms. They wanted to raise vegetables, cattle, goats, and more. Three criteria were paramount: good soil, a place to stay, and inexpensive land. We could offer all three.

According to National Geographic's online personal energy meter, we use 97% less energy than the national average.

After a two year search and talking to about a dozen serious applicants, we found what has turned out to be a perfect match.

Here's the deal. Think of it as a life insurance policy and/or "fragile care" on our home turf.

They get:

- Leased land (at a \$1/yr) on which to raise goats, cultivate their vegetable gardens and keep bees.
- A small cabin in which to live, temporarily.
- Ten acres (deeded to them) for a house site and future barn.
- Use of our barn (for goats, tools, and hay storage) and greenhouse (for starting seeds).
- Pine lumber, cut on the land, for framing their future home.
- Shared use of the chicken house.

We get:

- All we can eat (fresh vegetables in season, some meat, and root cellar crops out of season).
- Goat yogurt, milk, and goat cheese.
- Shared woods management.

- Honey.
- Assistance with odd jobs.
- Assistance with firewood harvesting, cutting, and splitting.
- House (and chicken, duck, and cat) sitting when we're traveling.
- Increased help and assistance as we age.
- The pleasure of working and living with energetic, engaged, and intelligent fellow nurturers of the land.

It's an unusual, perhaps unique, agreement. No money is exchanged; however, we've built up trust and seen the partnership work. We hold weekly lunch meetings to review projects, discuss pertinent issues and get to know each better. Our kids fully support the endeavor. Others will have different approaches, molded by their particular situation and personalities.

Who knows what the next generation will bring thirty plus years from now? We hope the back-to-the-land movement continues to gain momentum. On Oak Hill we know our land will continue to be productive under this generation's stewardship.

Living simply, responsibly, and sustainably has rich rewards.



BRIAN KENT

Brian Kent is a consulting planner and designer who specializes in downtown revitalization projects, agricultural land conservation, land use planning, and educational publications. He has prepared downtown plans for over 25 Maine towns and villages. His work has been recognized by the Maine Association of Planners, the Northern New England Planning Association and the American Planning Association.

Letter, continued from page 2

class propaganda." They cite the civil rights movement as an example of a potent narrative. The Green Party needs a phrase such as "Catch the wave", although that particular phrase is not self-explanatory. Perhaps "Catch the green wave", huh? And we need music. A jingle maybe. A catchy tune with simple lyrics. Attempts have been made in the past to come up with a theme song, but nothing has caught on.

As I read the first couple paragraphs of Rensenbrink's article on "Catching the Wave", I was reminded that, in the late nineties, many Green Party candidates used the slogan "Neither right nor left but upfront." I have not noticed it being used lately, but it seemed to resonate at the time.

Rensenbrink advises Greens not to try to take the world on our shoulders. That causes burn-out. "There's a vibrant, creative, life [already] out there", he says. "Don't assume a separation." What we should strive to be is a catalyst to help enable good

things to happen that are beginning to happen but would otherwise not bear fruit. Good advice. In the twenty or so years I have been in the Green Party, I have seen many burn-outs, and experienced some myself. A wonderful and freeing image for me is "Catching the Wave."



BARBARA RODGERS-HENDRICKS

member of the Green Party of Florida, was a principal founder of the Green Politics Network, a precursor of the Green Party of the U.S. She was candidate for U.S. Representative from the first district of Florida in 1992. She is a retired educator and counselor and lives in Santa Rosa Beach, Florida.

SAVING THE EARTH

in our Backyards

Editor's Note: This article is based on a talk given by the author on Earth Day, 2012, at the Liberty Hyde Bailey Museum in South Haven, Michigan. Editor

When we speak of saving the earth we usually mean saving life on the earth. The earth as a geological reality has already been ravaged for the resources we think we need. But our concern now is for the many species in the community of life on earth that are threatened. Many are facing extinction. Scientists who study life, past and present, such as paleontologists, ecologists, or evolutionary biologists, are telling us that we are already in the midst of the sixth great extinction. This loss of biodiversity increased as humans gradually became the dominant form of life. Unlike previous massive extinctions, such as the fifth extinction some 65 million years ago when a huge asteroid struck the earth and ended the age of dinosaurs, humans are now causing the current loss of biodiversity — the sixth extinction.

MAYNARD KAUFMAN

CURRENT THREATS TO BIODIVERSITY

Humans are threatening biodiversity in a variety of ways. The paleoanthropologist, Richard Leakey, has summarized three ways in which humans cause the extinction of other forms of life: first by killing them for food, second, by introducing alien species into new ecosystems, and, third, by destroying the habitat of other creatures, as in deforestation. In other words, humans have taken over the land. But we can change how we live on the land by replacing alien species with native plants and reforesting our lawns. I will try to explain why this is important and necessary. In this country, according to Douglas Tallamy, we have turned 54 percent of the land into cities, roads and suburbs. Only 41 percent of the land is now occupied by various forms of agriculture. Suburbanites control a significant percentage of the land in America and they can and should learn to share it with other forms of life.

Our industrial way of life will also be threatening biodiversity in the near future as we literally change the climate. The gases given off by burning fossil fuels are causing global warming, and as the climate changes and weather becomes more unpredictable, it will add to the loss of species in a massive way.

There is much we can do to strengthen biodiversity as we prepare for climate change, and this is the main topic of this paper. But first I have to raise some questions about that most cherished icon of the suburb in America: the lawn. We have planted over 40 million acres of lawn in this country, and we spread more fertilizer on our lawns annually than India uses on all its cropland. 40 percent of all pesticides in this country are used on lawns. Americans spend 45 billion dollars a year on their lawns; they are a big business with a lot of vested interests. Lawns are watered liberally so they stay green and grow fast. And then they are mowed regularly with inefficient engines that produce as much pollution in an hour as driving a car 650 miles. All for vanity,

“We have planted over 40 million acres of lawn in this country, and we spread more fertilizer on our lawns annually than India uses on all its cropland.”

“Because native trees, shrubs and perennial wild flowers are deeply rooted, they are more drought resistant, save water, and sequester more carbon, important characteristics as we face global warming.”

since the lawn is an ecological desert. Lawn grass, such as Kentucky blue grass (not native to Kentucky), is nearly always an alien species that provides food for no insects. Even worse, lawns may support the larvae of an alien pest, the Japanese beetle, according to Tom Small, who recently published a book on the value of native plants. Lawns are a nearly total ecological liability.

Lawns should be replaced with native trees and bushes and wildflowers, which are not only beautiful but are able to provide food for a wide variety of insects. And these, in turn, provide feed for birds. These food chains are essential for a viable ecosystem. But as people yielded to the appeal of exotic varieties peddled in garden catalogs, they often planted varieties that were not digestible by the insects that evolved here. According to the entomologist, Douglas Tallamy, our native flowering dogwood supports 117 species of moths and butterflies, while the Kousa dogwood from China supports no insect herbivores at all. Our native oak trees support the growth of over 500 species of insects, more than any other tree. The Monarch butterfly loves the nectar of the so-called butterfly bush, *Buddleia davidii*, a non-native plant, but they need native milkweed in order to reproduce. In other words, specific insect larva evolved with certain specific plants and only their leaves are chemically digestible by the insects that evolved with them. Alien plants or trees that did not evolve with our native insects are often touted as being resistant to insect damage. But when we choose such alien plants that are resistant to insect damage, like the Norway maple, many insects are deprived of sustenance.

LOSS OF ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY

I realize that we live in a society that does not love insects. Insecticide manufacturers thrive by fostering “insectophobia.” When we see an insect we scream, “Eek, a bug!” and reach for the spray can. But the way to deal with “bad” insects is to strengthen biological pest control with insect predators and parasites. This can reduce populations of insects that cause us trouble. Spraying broad spectrum pesticides that kill insects indiscriminately is counter-productive. Insects serve a vital ecological function: they eat plants and store the energy from plants and make it available as they are eaten by birds and other animals. And insects are nutritious, with more protein than beef. Finally, the biodiversity of a vital ecosystem is what sustains our lives as well. Humans also depend on the web of life.

As insect populations decline, so do the birds they would otherwise feed on. The World Conservation Union has estimated that 12 percent of all bird species are extinct because of habitat loss and invasive species. Since 1960 we in this country have lost

40 percent of our songbirds. Amphibians like frogs and toads are also suffering because of the way we have chosen to live.

We have been considering some of the problems caused by the introduction of various alien species into our ecosystem. In doing so we have focused on how alien species threaten biodiversity. But there are related problems which are even more visible. The introduction of an alien plant or insect, into an area where it has no natural enemies, means that it can easily become a troublesome invasive. Local examples include especially plants like the autumn olive or the multiflora rose, which gradually crowd out native plants. In other regions of the country plants like the kudzo vine or mile-a-minute have become serious pests. I am trying to eradicate autumn olive on my land because it is so invasive and it does not provide food for insects.

Let’s turn now to some of the many advantages of adding more native plants to our suburban lots. Because native shrubs and perennial wild flowers are deeply rooted, they are more drought resistant, save water, and sequester more carbon. These are important characteristics as we face global warming. As we plant such perennials on our lawns we also reduce carbon emissions by having less lawn to mow. Even more important is the fact that native perennials add to biodiversity by providing food for a wide diversity of insects. Finally, a greater diversity of insects can provide more biological pest control with predators and parasites and thereby reduce the need for insecticides. As an organic farmer and gardener I have always trusted in a natural balance in raising crops, and it works. It will work even better if we have more plants to feed insects.

BIOPHILIA CAN HELP TO SUSTAIN BIODIVERSITY

Edward O. Wilson, the famous biological writer, feels confident that we all share what he calls biophilia, a love of nature, and that we humans want to protect, restore, and enjoy biodiversity. Many of us prefer to live in natural or rural areas. Liberty Hyde Bailey did promote the subdivision of land for rural residents at a time when the automobile made life in the suburbs possible. I believe we want to co-exist with birds and small animals. We enjoy watching butterflies, and many are beautiful even in the caterpillar stage of their development. If we damaged the biodiversity of our region by planting alien species, we did so mostly out of ignorance. Or at least I did so when I planted exotic flowers without thinking about whether they would be good for insects. Now that we know the importance of native species, our love of nature can be reinforced by a sense of moral obligation. We should do the right thing in the light of the knowledge we now have. And the right thing, in summary, is to plant native perennial flowers, shrubs and trees on parts of our lawn. Because of biophilia, many people have already done so. This is the kind of ecological restoration that can be done only in our suburban yards, and it will contribute to more biodiversity even as it makes our places more beautiful.

Saving the Earth, continued on page 7...

Miraculous BIRTH *of the* “TEN KEY VALUES” STATEMENT

OUR FAMILY

On the weekend of August 10-12, 1984, at the apex of the Reagan Era, 62 thinkers and activists from across the U.S. came together on the leafy campus of Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota, to found what eventually became the U.S. Green Party. Because I had written the book *New Age Politics* and was editor of the Washington D.C.-based political newsletter *New Options*, both often seen as proto-Green, I was one of those invited to attend.

Politically, our founding meeting was diverse. Bioregionalists sat down with capitalists, libertarians with world-order advocates. Eight of us had ties to Murray Bookchin's Institute for Social Ecology. Even more of us had been associated with the New World Alliance, a national “transformational” political organization I'd helped found in 1979 and disband in 1983.

The document conceived at St. Paul – the “Ten Key Values” statement (ten foundational values and their descriptions) – was soon taken up as a recruitment and discussion device by Green groups across the U.S. To this day, a modified version of it stands near the beginning of the U.S. Greens' national platform, and many Green locals profess versions of it. As I am now 65 and losing my eyesight (though not my Vision), I thought it might be useful for me to set down my recollections of the birth of the original values statement, to which I still give my allegiance.

CONCEPTION

The document was conceived spontaneously one night at a marathon plenary workshop led by activist Jeff Land. About 50 of us were trying to think of a project that could help define us and put us on the political map. We were exhausted and sprawled all over the floor of a Macalester lounge – the conference had been intense! – but everyone sensed that something important could come out of Jeff's workshop.

What happened next was something I've experienced only a couple of times in my long life. A “collective brain” seemed to take hold, and we began working together as one.

No single individual came up with the idea of a values statement; it just welled up from out of our intense discussion. Early on, I remember suggesting something along the lines of the “Values and Ethics” chapter in my *New Age Politics* book. Another person suggested we look to the Black Panthers' “Ten Point Plan” from the 1960s. Several people spoke enthusiastically about the German Greens' “Four Pillars” statement. Someone mentioned an old Populist document.

Seamlessly, we began discussing what our own values or pillars might be. Someone began recording our suggestions on a large flip chart behind Jeff. Ten, 15, 20 suggestions went up on the chart with seemingly no end in sight. I remember saying we should ultimately whittle our list down to 10. I am afraid I said something Washington D.C.-like about the importance of political marketing. Jeff became exhausted and I took over facilitating the discussion until we adjourned, at which point folks were invited to come visit me at one of the dining room tables behind the lounge, to help think our next steps through.

MARK SATIN

*I wanted Greens to develop
a political perspective that
was genuinely new.*

*Bioregionalists sat down with
capitalists, libertarians with
world-order advocates...*

Many people visited me at that dimly lit table. I believe the first was feminist theorist Charlene Spretnak, which delighted me since Charlene was the principal organizer of our founding meeting. Also coming back there to talk was a variety of socialists, anarchists, and “social ecologists.” That delighted me too, since they represented a different wing of the Green movement from mine and I wanted them on board.

BEHIND THE SMILING FAMILY

The paragraph above is a cleaned-up account of my feelings, but contemporary activists deserve more. Without some inkling of the fraught personal dynamics at the founding meeting, it is impossible to understand the real, human context out of which the Ten Key Values arose.

Many structural obstacles confronted our group in 1984, all sadly familiar to you – the two-party system, media disinterest, etc. But we still had a shot at breaking through. In the mid-1980s, plenty of wealthy or well-placed people (many of them subscribers to my newsletter) stood ready to help a Greenish political organization that exhibited the focus and leadership skills to actually take on the Democrats and Republicans.

What kept us back, in my opinion, was an obstacle more difficult to talk about, because it came from within. And that was our less-than-collegial way of relating to one another. Spiritual or Marxist, male or female, too many of us came across at our founding meeting and for many years afterwards as feuding, immature, alienated bullies; and we did not structure ourselves in ways that might have mitigated that. Our potential sources of expertise and money – not the sort of people to be impressed by words alone – quickly sniffed that out.

It would be easy for me to sit back and write only about other people at the meeting to illustrate my point. But it’s not consistent with the Green key value of personal responsibility. So I’ll tell a couple of stories that suggest my wary or antagonistic feelings, as well as those of others.

I definitely felt wary when Charlene sat down at my table. That spring, I had written what I felt was a positive and constructively critical review of her *Green Politics* book. She had responded to it with a letter that I felt was wildly over the top. It began with the phrase “How dare you ...,” employed such epithets as “slimy,” and informed me that in my case “the personal is not only political, it’s disastrous.” She followed that up with a card that was even crueler. My less-than-benign feelings did not abate when, after sitting down, she told me she’d come by to make sure I didn’t mess things up – and the phrase she used was a lot stronger than “mess things up.”

I had similarly mixed feelings when admirers of Murray Bookchin and social ecology showed up at my table. I first saw Murray at a conference in Winnipeg in 1979, where we were featured speakers. I introduced myself and began telling him how much his book *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* had influenced my thinking. He quickly cut me off, told me that my *New Age*

Politics was the “work of a dilettante,” and turned away with a look of disgust on his face. I couldn’t believe it. By the time of the Green meeting, though, I had experienced that non-collegial reaction (and even that look!) from too many social ecologists and allied anarchists, and I was sick of it.

If you’ve guessed by now that I was as prickly as anyone else at the founding meeting, you’d be right. For example, one of Murray’s co-workers – a very savvy social ecologist named Gloria Goldberg – had left me and my Vermont Republican friend John McClaughry off the invitation list to the meeting. I wrote a wildly over-the-top letter to Charlene and the other organizers, and spoke with Charlene by phone, arguing that Gloria’s exclusion of John and me could not possibly be an accident. Suffice it to say that the recipients of these ministrations were not impressed by my “logic,” nor did they appreciate my exasperated tone.

Looking back now after nearly three decades, I feel more empathy for our misbehavior – others’ and mine – than I used to. The Cold War was in full bloom; fear and a sense of urgency were our daily bread. Despite our sincere spiritual practices or enjoyable socio-political roles (or both), most of us were working ourselves to exhaustion for social change, most of us still felt rotten for not having stopped the Vietnam War *before over one million people had been slaughtered*, and most of us felt distinctly underappreciated by the society at large. Sometimes even our families looked away. And it wasn’t just the Greens. I had experienced thin-skinnedness, barely-disguised competitiveness, and related frailties before – in the ecologically and spiritually minded New World Alliance. Others had experienced similar phenomena in other post-Vietnam groups struggling to be heard.

What’s surprising, then – even somewhat miraculous – is not that the Ten Key Values statement failed to take the political arena by storm, but that it got written and distributed at all. Despite our manifold personal and political conflicts, there was enough strength in our souls – fire in our bellies – and love in our hearts – that we were able to create a process that brought the statement into being. I want this article to memorialize that. I want this article to celebrate the fact that, in a dark time, a group of stressed and often deeply imperfect Americans was able to overcome its resentments and differences and articulate the basis for a Green society that could help heal all of us in this nation. Not least of all, the attendees themselves.

GESTATION

On the morning of our last day, a plenary session assigned Charlene and me the task of drafting the Ten Key Values statement (a list of the values themselves plus brief descriptions of each). We were to base our draft on the discussions held during the meeting and on any suggestions we might receive from meeting participants over the weeks ahead.

Charlene then suggested adding a third person to the mix, futurist and activist Eleanor LeCain. I immediately objected.

I want this article to celebrate the fact that, in a dark time, a group of stressed and often deeply imperfect Americans was able to overcome its resentments and differences and articulate the basis for a Green society that could help heal all of us in this nation. Not least of all, the attendees themselves.

Although I liked and respected Eleanor, I said I would not work on a political committee ever again after my disastrous experiences in the New World Alliance. I said I wanted to work swiftly and efficiently with one person. I added that if Charlene or I needed additional help, I was sure we could enlist volunteers without making them part of our decision-making duo.

Two people spoke in support of my position and none spoke against it. Charlene and I were declared the only draft decision-makers – the official co-drafters – with the proviso that we were each permitted (and even encouraged) to seek informal, individual assistance from anyone who'd attended the founding meeting. Thus Charlene obtained individual assistance from Eleanor (both of them lived in Berkeley at the time), and back in D.C. I obtained individual help from meeting participants Gerald Goldfarb and Robert Theobald.

DNA TEST

So, for the record: the statement was not produced by a “scribe committee” consisting of Charlene, Eleanor, and me, as Charlene asserts in an article about our early history (type “Green Politics – German Historical Institute” into Google and scroll to p. 48). There was no committee. Nor is Charlene the only author, although she's credited as such in Roger Gottlieb's important anthology *This Sacred Earth* (1995) and by some Green groups online. For better or worse, Charlene and I were the designated, and equal, co-drafters. And I can assure you we each did at least half of the work!

GESTATION (CONTINUED)

How did Charlene and I manage to carry it off? Despite our differences (which were never resolved), we had one transcendent thing in common – a commitment to working every founding Green's views into our draft text. Also, invaluable suggestions and policy proposals kept coming in to us. Thanks to Charlene's willingness to cover the massive long-distance phone bills (an impediment to collaborative writing that Internet-age activists would never know), Charlene and I spent ridiculous numbers of

hours on the phone attempting to integrate every Green's relevant thoughts and perfect every dash and comma.

The biggest problem we faced was that many of the founding Greens' most wonderful ideas were incompatible with one another. The solution we hit upon was to look behind the positions people were taking. Although Greens' policy positions were incredibly diverse in 1984, the questions we were asking to reach those positions were actually quite similar and characterized by such qualities as depth, courage, and long-term vision. So Charlene and I ended up describing each of the ten values in the form of open-ended questions, as you'll see below.

I have to confess that I advocated this approach because of another consideration as well: I wanted Greens to develop a political perspective that was genuinely new, and not just some updated version of anarcho-socialism. (Which is not to say that anarcho-socialists cannot help us get to that new place. On the contrary, they must help.) So by phrasing the descriptions as open-ended questions, rather than as hortatory statements full of “musts” and “shoulds,” I was hoping to inspire us to think creatively and originally about the problems we face.

Although some Green groups, including the Green Party of California, have retained the open-ended questions, it broke my heart that the national Green Party soon did away with them in favor of a torrent of “wills,” “musts,” and “shoulds.” For example, under the “Ecological Wisdom” value, Charlene and I wrote, “How can we operate human societies with the understanding that we are *part* of nature, not on top of it?” By contrast, the Ecological Wisdom value in the national Green platform for 2012 states, “Human societies must operate with the understanding that we are part of nature, not separate from nature.” Which formulation do you think better lends itself to dialogue and mutual learning? One is hands-on (“How can we operate...”), provocative (“...on top of ...”), and exploratory; the other smacks of bureaucratic fiat.

THE NEWBORN

The Ten Key Values statement was approved by our Interregional Committee and released in late 1984. The original key values

[B]y phrasing the descriptions as open-ended questions, rather than as hortatory statements full of “musts” and “shoulds,” I was hoping to inspire us to think creatively and originally about the problems we face.

were Ecological Wisdom, Grassroots Democracy, Personal and Social Responsibility, Nonviolence, Decentralization, Community-Based Economics, Postpatriarchal Values, Respect for Diversity, Global Responsibility, and Future Focus. As explained above, each was followed by a series of questions. Here are three questions under the Future Focus value:

How can we induce people and institutions to think in terms of the long-range future, and not just in terms of their short-range selfish interest? [Note the “just” in that sentence. For me, it was a nod to human nature; for Charlene, a concession to Western civ as we know it. – M.S.] ... How can we induce our government and other institutions to practice fiscal responsibility? [Twenty-five years before the Tea Party! – M.S.] How can we make the quality of life, rather than open-ended economic growth, the focus of future thinking?

And here are the questions following Global Responsibility:

How can we be of genuine assistance to grassroots groups in the Third World – and what can WE learn from such groups? How can we help other countries make a transition to self-sufficiency in food and other basic necessities? How can we cut our defense budget while maintaining an adequate defense? How can we promote these ten Green values in reshaping our global order? How can we reshape the global order without creating [the equivalent of] just another enormous nation-state?

Charlene and I wanted our text to model our movement as we hoped to see it someday – incisive and responsible and humane; with every part connected to and nourishing every other part. I like to think we succeeded.

A PROUD FATHER’S (INEVITABLE?) LAMENT

After the Ten Key Values statement was birthed, I hoped Greens would dedicate themselves to ONE activity only – assiduously recruiting candidates and helping them run for

office – and that *comfort with the Ten Key Values statement* (non-ideological and open to a wide range of interpretations) would be the sole criterion for Green or Green-supported candidacies.

In a scheduled plenary speech at the first national Green Gathering (1987) and in corridors and over dining tables at the next two Gatherings (1989 and 1990), I passionately argued for that position. No 50-page political platforms, no non-electoral activities, no grandiose consensus processes, no divisive internal bickering – just focus mightily on the knitting: help 50,000 good people run for something every two years. Devote all our national energies to that. Suppress our egos and “be of use,” as the great Marge Piercy says. But in the 1980s, our Interregional Committee took a different course.

To this day I am convinced that, had we chosen to be a national political party from the start, with the Ten Key Values and their burning, pointed questions as our rallying cry, we would be significantly more influential than we became.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I’d like to thank three admirably solid founding meeting attendees – Steve Chase, Robert Gilman, and W. Hunter Roberts – for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper. I am, of course, solely responsible for the final product.



MARK SATIN

participated in SNCC and SDS, then co-founded the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme, which helped bring Vietnam-era draft resisters to Canada. His book *New Age Politics* (Dell, 1978) attempted to articulate a coherent post-socialist ideology for his generation. After publishing the idealistic *New Options Newsletter* in the 1980s and practicing

business law in the 1990s, Mark addressed the mainstream with his book *Radical Middle* (Basic, 2004). Although panned by the Democratic Leadership Council, it was chosen best book of 2003-04 by the Ecological and Transformational Politics Section of APSA. Wikipedia’s biography of Mark was recently named a “Featured Article” there, one of only about 3,600 out of over four million.

THE GREENS HAVE TAKEN OVER AND ALL IS WELL!!

Editor's Note: The following article is based on a speech by Pam Hartwell-Herrero, Mayor of Fairfax, California, to an audience of Green Party delegates from all parts of the country at the U.S. Green Party convention in Baltimore, July 12-15. She gave the talk shortly before the Convention nominated Jill Stein for President.

Greens have been on the Town Council in Fairfax, California since 1999. In 2009 I was fortunate to join two existing Green Party members on the Council. My election established us as the only current Green Party majority council in the nation. We now hold 4 out of 5 seats on that council. The Greens have taken OVER and all is well!

In the past several years, we have done work in Fairfax for which we are very proud. We are best known for our environmental policy work on Marin Clean Energy, Open Space preservation, GMO labeling, Pesticide, Plastic and Styrofoam bans, and don't even get me started on our Zero Waste garbage contract where we will be getting to a 94% diversion away from the landfill by 2020.

But today I want to tell you about our economic policies. As I do, I ask that you keep in mind who makes up our town council. We are citizens—parents, workers, volunteers, living mostly normal lives, enacting changes in our community through shockingly basic means: hard work, research, negotiation, compromise, debate, trial and error.

GETTING IT DONE

We occupy the city government of Fairfax not only with ideas and principles, but also with the determination to do the boring part: getting it done. If there's something to take from these brief remarks, that's it: Fairfax made these accomplishments happen because we formed coalitions with everyone, grew political will, and we push until we get them done. Here is what we have done on the economic front:

We had a progressive majority before we had a Green majority and one of the early actions of that Council was to establish a fair wage ordinance. They believed that the health and welfare of all Fairfax residents is benefitted when all Fairfax workers are paid a living wage. Many of our workers and families in the town live at or below the poverty line, and paying inadequate wages had a negative effect on everyone in Fairfax. A living wage tells each worker they are valued, and builds wealth in the entire community. They also passed a ban on nationally owned chain stores, to ensure the unique character of our community, but also because doing business with our neighbors ensures our town's autonomy, economic security, and collective solidarity. I came into elected office after serving for 5 years as the Executive Director of a nonprofit that educates and advocates on sustainable policy and resilient lifestyle. One project that spanned the work of that nonprofit and my service to the Town of Fairfax was the FairBuck, a local currency, launched last year. The FairBuck is an initiative of Sustainable Fairfax, the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, and the Fairfax Town Council. Using this shiny little 3 dollar token, residents, visitors, and businesses have an opportunity to invest in Fairfax. FairBucks keeps money local, generates funds for community projects and encourages conversation about economic alternatives.

PAMELA HARTWELL-HERNERO

*FairBucks keeps money local,
generates funds for community
projects and encourages conversation
about economic alternatives*

*We believe public tax dollars should
NOT be placed in private banks for
private gain. Public money should be
in public banks for public good.*

“But, what I’m really here to tell you today is that, despite the accolades, and despite the importance of what we are able to do, there’s nothing exceptional about the fact that we do it. The policies we enact are pragmatic, realistic, and feasible—they are not “utopian” or far-fetched.”

PUBLIC BANKING

And has that conversation about economic alternatives ever been fruitful! Soon after the launch of the FairBuck we supported statewide legislation to form a public bank like the one in North Dakota. We believe public tax dollars should NOT be placed in private banks for private gain. Public money should be in public banks for public good. Municipalities, small businesses and students should all be able to borrow money at reasonable interest rates that do not line the pockets of Large Private bankers.

Most recently, we worked with staff to Move Our Money. Our \$7 million town budget and all the banking services that go with it are, as we speak, being moved from the Bank of America to the Bank of Marin, a small community bank. And the town is saving money on services. Doing the right thing is no longer more expensive. With the rate of bank bailouts and resulting home foreclosures skyrocketing, we were dedicated to working with and supporting a community bank with low mortgage turnover that dedicated funds to local non-profits.

When Fairfax incorporated in 1931 as a party town on the train headed north from San Francisco, nobody would have guessed that our small town 81 years later would contain the only majority Green Party government in the country. We have become a place where local political initiatives synthesize with national and global campaigns for social and economic justice, a place where the beauty of Northern California combines with vital policy to improve our world and our day to day lives on this precious planet. But that’s how political and economic change starts: In the most intimate and normal of spaces. We are like you- simply citizens who love our town and have a desire to improve the future. We represent constituents who want to live sustainably and responsibly in their community, and need structures, support networks, information, and education to do so. Personally, these issues were important to me as a mother as well as an educator and advocate. But, what I’m really here to tell you today is that, despite the accolades, and despite the importance of what we are able to do, there’s nothing exceptional about the fact that we do it. The policies we enact are pragmatic, realistic, and feasible—they are not “utopian” or far-fetched. In fact, these policies are part of a groundswell of socially, environmentally, and economically responsible policymaking happening in communities around this nation.

Living wage ordinances are emerging all over the country and although these ordinances are sometimes vetoed by leaders who

cater to interests different than our own, the movements keep springing up, and each time there’s a living wage struggle, more people are educated about the relationship between the other person’s quality of life and our own. Campaigns for living wages teach us about our interconnectedness. I have also been contacted by numerous other communities working on passing their own Chain Store Bans.

There are hundred of local currencies in the US: Detroit Cheers is being used by several businesses. One of the business owners called it “Detroit’s economic stimulus package.” Ithaca, New York has Ithaca Hours. In Piedmont, North Carolina, the Plenty Currency Cooperative has been operating since 2002 with the goal of safeguarding jobs and differentiating local culture from “big box stores and Generic Americana.” Since its start in 2006, \$2.3 million worth of BerkShares have been circulated.

Legislation and feasibility studies to create regional and state public banks are being looked at in 17 states. And thanks to the Occupy movement and the horrific practices of the big multi-national banks—people, towns and businesses are following the Move Our Money command and taking their money to credit unions and community banks all over the country.

To “occupy” today means to take control of our own destiny. Doing business with all your neighbors is the key to solidarity. We demand that the real alternative to corporate capitalist management is collective, democratic self-management. And as we look at the Green Party platform, from electoral reform to economic reform, from a peace-oriented foreign policy to environmental sensibility, we need to remember that each of those big ideas consists of a lot of perfectly feasible, starkly pragmatic policies that can and must be enacted at every level of government. All of which will take a hell of a lot of patience, focus, discipline, and hard work.

So I invite you all, especially the advocates and educators to join me in Occupying public office. And if you don’t get in right away, don’t wait for the next election, work with the electeds there.

Do the hard work to build the future we need!

Please note: The opinions expressed in this article are those of this individual Council member and are not representative of the entire council or Town of Fairfax unless otherwise stated. - Pam H-H

	PAM HARTWELL-HERRERO
	is the Mayor of Fairfax, Ca, the only Green Party Majority Town Council in the country. She is the Development Director of Public Banking Institute and former Executive Director of Sustainable Fairfax. Ms. Hartwell-Herrero is co-author of the book <i>Grassroots Sustainability: A Guide to Organizing a Thriving Community</i> . www.grassrootssustainability.org

WHY I'M NOT GREEN

Yet!

Editor's note: Kat Williams gave the following speech as Commentator for a Workshop at the U.S. Green Party's annual convention in 2012 (the Presidential nominating convention) in Baltimore on Friday, July 13. The standing-room-only Workshop discussed a proposed "Open Letter to the American People."

My name is Kat Williams.
 I am a feminist.
 I am pro-choice.
 I am in favor of marriage equality.
 I believe that men and women should make equal pay for equal work.
 I am in favor of campaign finance reform.
 I believe it is crucial that individuals participate in politics in any way they can.
 I am in favor of free speech and believe that media reform is vital.
 I believe everyone deserves clean air and water, and I deplore mountain top removal.
 I am in favor of peace and disarmament.
 I demand that my civil liberties be restored.
 I most certainly do Not believe that corporations are people.
 AND, LIKE YOU,
 I believe that there are 2 sides to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict.
 BUT, I am NOT a registered Green.

KAT WILLIAMS

I want to talk about what I hope this letter to the American people will do to lure me and others like me, to the Green Party.

There are a lot of people like me and I want to talk about what I hope this letter to the American people will do to lure me and others like me, to the Green Party.

My participation in this workshop came about after a conversation I had with John Rensenbrink a year ago in which I asked him, "Why am I not a Green?" I continued to ponder this question and over the course of the last few months have had many conversations with friends and acquaintances about this topic and asked them (because they too agree with most of your platform) the same question and in nearly every single case they pointed to fear.

PEOPLE GRIPPED BY FEAR

What will happen if the Democrats lose? What will become of women's rights if the Republicans win? What about healthcare? Who will make the next supreme court appointments? How could we survive the republican war machine? All questions and fears I grapple with too.

Then I realized that in our minds, you, the Green Party, is being defined by that fear. People don't know you, they don't know what you have accomplished or just how you can make a difference in their lives so they define you based on what they DON'T know about you. And as we all know the fear of the unknown can be petrifying.

I urge you to be the leadership we need...It is not enough to give us things to do without leading the way. Most of us want to be that kind of change but have no idea where to start.

It is my hope that this letter to the American people will be disseminated widely. That it will speak to the basic needs of individuals in small towns and communities around the country. I honestly believe that there are thousands of people who want the change you offer. But until we know you, understand you and believe that you really can be an alternative to the power and corruption of the two-party system, we will continue to stick with what we know, the lesser of two evils, because to do otherwise is simply too scary.

THINGS GREENS CAN DO

But, I do think there are things the Greens can do to help us get past this fear. And, I believe that this letter to the American people will be a huge step in addressing some of the issues at the crux of those fears.

First, and I know you all have heard this many times: a vote for a Green party candidate in a national election is a “throw away” vote. On a national level perhaps it is. I am most certainly not the first person to point this out to you, but the Green party does not have the money to compete with the two major parties. So, if all people know of you is your national efforts, then clearly they do not know you at all or how you can and many cases already do, govern on the local level. Tell us. Tell us about your successes.

Second, many people believe you are a movement, and a movement with only one cause, the environment. I live in West Virginia and I know how important it is to protect the environment. Our air and water are polluted every single day by the coal companies. In fact, the individual group with the lowest life expectancy in this country is women from McDowell County, WV. We know the reasons, pollution. But, if you venture into McDowell County, WV and talk to them about politics, they will tell you that the Republicans help the coal operators and the Democrats help the unions. “What,” you could ask, “about the Green Party?” And, you will likely get a response like this one, “Who? You mean those environmentalists? They are going to take our jobs. Do away with coal. They can save all the owls they want, just leave their hands off my job.”

The people there need hope. They need an alternative because trust me when I tell you neither the Republicans nor the Democrats are looking out for them. Tell them. Tell those folks what you can do for them. I am not suggesting that environmental issues should be ignored, also take the time to explain your jobs plan, your ideas about tax equality, about job retraining and yes, explore *with* them *their* biggest concerns. I promise you your republican and democratic counterparts aren’t doing that for those people.

McDowell County, WV is not the only place you are needed of course. Tell all of us what you do, who you are. Sing your own praises. When and where did you get a candidate elected and what did she or he do? Show us that you have experience and

know how to lead. Give us the alternative we so desperately seek but are so afraid to take.

This letter to the American people lists seven things we, Americans, can do. But few of them are things most people will do without guidance or support. Be that guidance.

- You urge us to get involved in our community, will you help us organize? Show us how? Come into our communities and teach us about organizing?
- You urge us to support changes in election laws and fight for easier access to third parties. How do we do that and where do we start?
- You ask us to join the movement to amend the US Constitution to assure that only individual human beings and not corporations are persons in the eyes of the law. Fine. I agree. Show us how?
- You ask us to vote for those we believe in, but that is the problem. We can only believe in what we know or understand. Help us to know you.
- You ask us to use our vote wisely, and only vote for those candidates and political parties who do not take corporate money. But we don’t even know who those candidates are. Teach us.
- You urge us to run for office, but few of us have the time or can afford to run for even a small local office. But, with help we can learn. Will you help us?
- You say we should support the independent media, to be the media if necessary. Are you willing to sponsor workshops that show us how to tell our stories?

It is not enough to give us things to do without leading the way. Most of us want to be that kind of change but have no idea where to start.

I urge YOU to be the leadership we need.

Editor’s Note: On returning from the Green Party convention in Baltimore, Kat Williams un-enrolled in the Democratic Party of West Virginia and enrolled in the Mountain Party of West Virginia, an affiliate of the Green Party of the United States.

	KAT WILLIAMS
	is Associate Professor of History at Marshall University in West Virginia. She is the former director of Women’s Studies at Marshall, former chair of the state Women’s Commission and former registered Democrat.

THE SWEDISH GREENS: Which Way Forward?

RESISTANCE TO NUCLEAR POWER THE BEGINNING

A fierce campaign against nuclear power and then a referendum in Sweden in early 1980 started it all – or perhaps released all the built-up political frustrations. The set-up of the referendum was meant to give a “yes” or “no” to continued use of nuclear power plants in Sweden, but was seen by many as manipulated by the then five established political parties in the Swedish parliament.

Three voting options had been presented – two “yes” and one “no”. The somewhat “green” Center Party and the Left Party supported NGOs, environmentalists, gender groups and other activists for a “no” and instead encouraged development of alternative energy. The Conservatives campaigned for a “yes” to nuclear power. As did the Social Democrats, though they wanted their own “yes” option. Their main position was that nuclear power plants needed to be owned by the State, something that the Conservatives opposed. Consequently, the Conservatives and Social Democrats were able to turn public worry about the safety of nuclear power plants into a traditional right-left economic-political issue of who should own them.

POLITICAL “PARADIGM SHIFT”

The “yes” campaigns won and the environmentalists, anti-nuclear power activists, groups working for gender equality, peace organizations and others on the losing side felt the core issue, and thus the outcome, had been manipulated and the general public worry about nuclear power had been ignored. Having just campaigned together, these groups knew each other well and had realized that they shared similar political ideas and a vision of another kind of society. They believed that care for the environment, individual and gender rights, attention to human development and similar issues were important even if that meant slower economic or material development. Political scientists, intellectuals and some journalists also sensed that a “paradigm shift” might take place in Swedish politics, away from a simple focus on economic growth and towards care for the environment, saving natural resources and giving priority to human needs.

This was the context in which the Swedish Green Party was formed in September 1981, one year ahead of the general elections of September 1982. The Greens set about building a campaign to surpass the 4% threshold for entering the Swedish Parliament as well as to make it into regional and local political bodies.

The proportional electoral system in Sweden seemed to make a Green breakthrough possible. But the Party faced great challenges. No new political party had actually entered the Swedish Parliament for the last 70 years or so. And while opinion polls were favorable to the Greens in late spring 1982 (running at 5-7%), getting the actual votes would be a lot harder. On the practical side, ballots had to be paid for and distributed, participation in media political debates must be negotiated, political information had to be distributed and not least: candidates had to be filed at all levels and in all parts of the country.

While the Greens themselves went about this with enthusiasm, other political parties were either silent or dismissed the party completely. The media in general, however,

RALPH MONÖ

The [Swedish] Greens really wanted to transform society.

The early electoral failures to enter Parliament may have been blessings in disguise for the Greens.

With the Green success, a big question surfaces; how do you remain a large political party if you have a political platform that advocates fundamental political change in Swedish society?

Building long term trust and loyalty between politicians and voters would be the best way to try to create the basis for long term political change.

failed to sense the changing political atmosphere in Sweden and some publicly made fun of the new party. As an early spokesperson for the party, I was once asked by a main radio news anchor, close to losing his temper with the stubborn spokesperson: “But how on earth is it possible to be outside the right-left political scale?”

TROUBLED BEGINNINGS

The onslaught from the political establishment in combination with the political inexperience of the Green candidates proved to be disastrous. Nationally the Greens failed, receiving only 1.6% nationally and thus not making it into Parliament. However, regionally and locally the Greens were able to secure in total around 100 seats. In retrospect, the outcome was probably very fortunate for the Greens; the political experience and effective political action needed for national political work in Parliament first had to be built at the local level.

In the early days of the Swedish Green Party, its asset was thought by many followers to be its radicalism. The Greens were not like any other party, fine-tuning shades of capitalist or socialist societies and finding its own nesting place on the right-left political scale. The Greens really wanted to transform society, making living in it meaningful beyond material wealth, implementing full gender equality, preventing economic growth from taking over politics and saving the world from resource depletion and ecological disaster.

The following general elections in 1985 dealt another blow, even harder than the first, to the Green parliamentary dream. Election results were even worse this time than in 1982, down to 1.5%. However, at regional and local level they were slightly up, perhaps a sign that the Greens were learning their trade.

PARLIAMENTARY BREAKTHROUGH AT LAST

A further three years later, the prospects for the Greens brightened. Environmental problems were extensively reported in the media, the Greens made a successful election campaign and capable spokespersons gained more voter confidence. These factors together finally catapulted the Greens over the 4% threshold into the Swedish parliament in September 1988. The Greens had now “opened up” politics in Sweden and become the first new political party entering Parliament in 75 years. The Greens had moreover shown that new issues, new political solutions and a new political party could be introduced on the Swedish political scene.

SHORT-LIVED SUCCESS

The new parliamentary party was, however, still both politically inexperienced and “fundamentalist Green” and turned out to be anything but effective in its parliamentary work. Many Green MPs routinely questioned their own elected leaders, often publicly, and individual opinions and egos in the parliamentary group made coordinated and effective political action virtually impossible. Internal suspicion toward “power concentration” soon grew while constituencies and the electorate tended to be ignored.

Long before the general elections of 1991 it was clear that the Greens would then be thrown out of Parliament.

Perhaps even this early electoral failure was a blessing in disguise for the Greens. The fundamentalist approach had had its chance and was now severely questioned internally. A long and difficult process toward “realistic” politics began. The decentralized party committees were given up in favor of a single, more efficient party board. Political issues were re-formulated with the electorate and a three parliamentary term political perspective in mind. Radical ideas of a Swedish “green” utopia were sidelined.

“REALISM” PAVED WAY FOR COMEBACK

At the 1994 general elections, the Greens were able to make a parliamentary comeback. But being reorganized and clear on general policies is one thing, knowing how to vote “Green” on every day-to-day political issues at national, regional and local political levels is quite another. But with major internal conflicts put aside, the Greens now learned to work efficiently.

Today, the Greens still seem by far the most imaginative and creative party among the present eight in the Swedish Parliament. Environmental issues, gender equality, decentralized organization and other Green issues have been fought fairly successfully by the Greens since 1994, also resulting in other parties picking up many of the Green ideas. In the 2010 election, the Greens had advanced from Sweden’s sixth to its third largest party in Parliament, after the Social Democrats and the Conservatives.

With the Green success, the big question surfaces; how do you remain a large political party if you have a political platform that advocates fundamental political change in Swedish society? It is quite clear that the Green agenda goes against what has been the driving force of the Swedish economy and its politics for decades and even centuries: focus on economic growth, increased resource use for higher material wealth, more pollution, economic interests before human health and before nature, etc? Just one example, how do you “sell” dramatically increased gasoline prices to the voters?

COULD THE GREENS ACHIEVE MORE?

If the Greens continue to increase their votes at the 2014 election, will their long term goal of fundamentally transforming society still be advocated? Today, “the environment” has become only one among many political issues that the Greens advocate. At the same time, all other political parties have adopted policies from the “Green” agenda. Success or failure? Perhaps a little of both. Awareness and action is greater than when the Green Party was created, yet one of the most serious environmental issues - climate change - is continuing at an alarming rate despite the rise of quite influential and committed Green parties all around the world since the 1970s.

So why are the Greens, in Sweden or in other countries, not doing or being able to do more to stop this and other threats to

humans or the environment? In my opinion there are many reasons for this and I will highlight a few.

Change, real change takes a long time! Changing fundamental mental perspectives and beliefs may require a time span of several generations - particularly so if we consider just how ingrained the old ones have become over centuries. Heating sources for buildings, transportation networks, economic infrastructure cannot be changed rapidly, nor can oil or gas dependence. In addition, great changes do not occur in isolation. Nations are today globally interdependent and no fuel or energy tax could be implemented in just some countries. Conversely, solutions to the global problems can only be implemented through global cooperation.

Since politicians primarily have to account for their actions on a short term basis - between two elections - "short term" becomes their planning horizon. This obviously is a real problem when many of the world's serious problems require long term solutions, often involving short term sacrifices.

Voter interest or awareness of problems and available possibilities for solutions are often not great enough to put pressure on politicians to act and solve even well known problems.

Just as competition between parties can be an asset for the voter, so competition may also be a great problem. One party may think it stands to gain if other parties fail and therefore choose not to cooperate to achieve (long term) solutions.

So, how could the Greens, or any political party for that matter, transform Swedish society despite these and a host of other obstacles?

BUILDING LONG TERM CONFIDENCE

This is a monumental question with no simple answer. But it has to be asked because of the severe global problems the world faces and because this is the task that the Greens set out to do. My thoughts, having contributed to the creation of the Greens in 1981 and worked with them for many years, would be:

First, of course, when creating day-to-day politics, always go back to the basic Green party vision. Focus the political message clearly, but work with the "whole".

Second, for a party which so obviously has one foot in the "here and now" and the other in a transformed future, it is necessary to always strike a balance between old and new, between long term and short term. Nobody can make an immediate jump to the future, and so real change needs to be gradual but steady.

Third, build long term alliances with movements, organizations, interest groups, etc who have or are likely to have a long term interest in supporting your vision and basic goals. For the Swedish Greens, that most probably includes environment, gender equality, peace, human rights, nature and internationally oriented movements as well as groups in society like the young, students, teachers, small businesses, scientists, new technology developers, etc. The list could be made very long.

The fourth area of interest would be the whole Green Party

relationship with its present and potential voters, particularly in the long term. So much is routinely being said about the need for strong leadership, but very little attention is paid to the fact that a leader is nothing without its followers. The knowledge about "followership" is now being studied by researchers and expanding in the business world. There are examples of companies where followers have been much more important to the success of the company than its leaders. An individual follows a political leader because of a belief or conviction, without being paid (as in the case of an employee situation). Building long term trust and loyalty between politicians and voters as well as exchanging knowledge, awareness and political thoughts on solutions would therefore be the best way to try to create commitment and a basis for long term political change.

Lastly, politics is "the art of the possible" between any two elections. Not all politicians are creative enough or dare be very creative in such a short time span. However, finding a "creative" solution to get out of an "old" political conflict or deadlock, is often the best way to move forward.

WILL THE GREENS DELIVER?

The prospects for the Swedish general elections in 2014 are good. The Greens may increase its share of the voters further, perhaps even of taking part in a new coalition Government.

But the question is: will 2014 be the time when a larger Swedish Green party will be content to adjust to politics as usual, with just a tint of Green? Or will it be the starting point when the Greens will both get more votes and be capable to creatively and aggressively move forward with the substantial issues they were created to help solve?



RALPH MONÖ

led the Swedish Friends of Earth in the late 1970s before being convinced that the Green movement also needed parliamentary representation. Ralph was elected member of the first Green party political committee in 1981 and for a time served as Green Party spokesperson before the 1982 general elections. He was also full time International Secretary for the Greens

1989-91 and Head of Offices 1999-2001. Ralph has also been Secretary General for the Federation of European Green Parties 1995-99 in Brussels and participated in several national green Party conferences in the US during that time. In addition to Green party involvement, Ralph has spent many years working for the Swedish Government in the field of development cooperation, including about 15 years in the field in Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Serbia and most recently in Albania. Ralph is currently Director for ULI Geoforum, a Swedish interest organization for development of geographic information and based in Stockholm.

NEW GREEN PARTY LAUNCHED IN JAPAN

RICHARD EVANOFF

On July 28, 2012 a group of local assembly members, citizens groups, and activists met in Tokyo to launch the Midori-no-to (Green Party), also referred to as the Greens Japan. The party was formed a little more than a year after a 9.0 earthquake and tsunami hit Japan on March 11, 2011, resulting in the meltdown of three nuclear reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant in the north.

The new 1,000-member party is in the process of meeting the legal requirements to become an officially registered party in time for Japan's next general election, which must be held by Autumn 2013 at the latest, but could come much sooner. The party plans to contest 10 seats in the Upper House election and other seats in the Lower House as finances permit.

The party's initiatives include proposals to eliminate Japan's reliance on nuclear energy and to promote the use of renewable energy as a way to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Both Japan's ruling party, the Democratic Party, headed by Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda, and the leading opposition party, the Liberal Democrats, support the restart of nuclear power stations that were shut down following the disaster. The Japan Green Party aims to give voters a clear anti-nuclear alternative at the election box. At the party's founding, deputy head Akira Miyabe stated, "A party that strongly pursues environmental policies is needed."

Recent anti-nuclear demonstrations in Tokyo and other areas have been the largest in Japan since the anti-war protests of the 1960s and 70s. The day after the founding of the Japan Green Party, an estimated 170,000 citizens held a candlelight vigil around Japan's parliament building, calling for an end to nuclear power. Anti-nuclear activists had previously collected 320,000 signatures asking for a referendum on nuclear power, but their request was voted down by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government on June 20.

The Green Party of Japan hopes to gain the support of civic groups concerned not only with nuclear issues but also about creating a sustainable society. The party's proposals include calls for an economy based on local production for local consumption, enhanced social security programs funded by a more equitable tax system, and greater democratic participation in the political process.

The Greens Japan are also opposed to Japan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) free-trade negotiations, which are being promoted by the current government as a way to

The day after the founding of the Japan Green Party, an estimated 170,000 citizens held a candlelight vigil around Japan's parliament building, calling for an end to nuclear power

increase economic growth, but would devastate domestic agriculture and lead to a further decline in Japan's already precarious food self-sufficiency rate. (Japan presently imports more than 60% of its food from overseas.)

The media is billing the Green Party of Japan as Japan's "first Green Party," but in fact two Green parties had previously emerged in the 1990s: the Japan Green Party and the Japan Green Federation. A successor political network, called the Rainbow and Greens, merged with these groups in 2008 to form an organization called the Midori-no-Mirai (Green Future). This latter group has had considerable success in local elections, including the 2010 election of Kazumi Inamura as Japan's first Green Mayor in the city of Amagasaki (in the Osaka area). The new Green Party of Japan is the most recent manifestation of these earlier political formations.



Richard and Echo Evanoff giving an outdoor talk for a citizens group working to protect the mountains west of Tokyo.

RICHARD EVANOFF

teaches environmental ethics at Aoyama Gakuin University in Tokyo, Japan. He is the author of *Bioregionalism and Global Ethics* and has been active with various green organizations, including the U.S. Greens Abroad, the International Green Network, and Friends of the Earth Japan, as well as with local campaigns to prevent road construction and mountain destruction in the area west of Tokyo, where he lives.



GREEN HORIZON

Green Horizon Sustainers for 2012

- Tony Affigne, Rhode Island
Theresa Amato and Todd Main, Illinois
Stephen A. Baker, Pennsylvania
David and Gillian Bath, Florida
John Battista and Justine McCabe, Connecticut
Dee Berry, Kansas
Antonio Blasé, Maine
Peter S. Broeksmit, Illinois
Charles and Diane Brown, Kansas
Lisanne Gray Budwick, New Jersey
Richard D. Burrill, Pennsylvania
J. Roy Cannon, New Jersey
Jonathan and Dorothy Carter, Maine
Dana Cary, Maine
Russ Christenson, Maine
David Cobb, California
Chris Cole, Maine
Don Crawford, Illinois
Richard and Debra Csenge, Utah
Morgen D'Arc, Maine
Bob Dale and Jean Parker, Maine
Christine De Troy, Maine
Jacqui Deveneau, Maine
Fred Dolgon, Maine
Paul Etxeberri, Nevada
Richard Evanoff, Japan
Valerie Face, California
Olenka Folda, Maine
Edmund D. Fowler, Ontario, Canada
Walter and Francine Fox, Pennsylvania
David and Melissa Frans, Maine
Bruce Gagnon and Mary Beth Sullivan, Maine
Betsy Garrold, Maine
Greg Gerritt and Kathleen E. Rourke, Rhode Island
Rhoda Gilman, Minnesota
Art Goodtimes, Colorado
Budd Dickinson and Jody Grage, Washington
David Greenwood, New Jersey
Christopher Greuner, Massachusetts
Chuck Harker, Maryland
Tian Harper, California
Holly Hart, Iowa
Gil Harris, Maine
Laura Hauck, New Jersey
Dorothy A. Hassfeld, Maine
Charles and Elizabeth McGee Hassrich, Illinois
Brandon L. Hewitt, Georgia
Fred Horch, Maine
Joseph R. Horgan, Maryland
Clare Howell, Maine
Abhi and Sid Hudson, Florida
Gus Jaccaci, Maine
Christopher Jones, New York
Maynard Kaufman and Barbara Geisler, Michigan
Brian Kent, Maine
Robert A. Kinsey, Colorado
Ben Kjelshus, Missouri
Barbard Knox, Maryland
David and Peg Krosschell, Ohio
Jim Krosschell and Cyndy Dockrell, Massachusetts
Kathryn Krosschell, Ohio
Paul Krumm, Kansas
Ellen La Conte, North Carolina
Margie MacWilliams, New Jersey
Audrey Marra, Maine
Linda B. Martin, Washington
Jim McCarthy, Maine
Kent Mesplay, California
Al Miller, Maine
Judith Mohling, Colorado
Terry Morgan, Maine
Daniel Moses and Charlene Spretnak, California
Dean Myerson, Oregon
Jason Nabewoniec, New York
Thomas H. and Magdalena R. Naylor, Vermont
Jon Olsen, Maine
Esther Lacognata and Barclay Palmer, Maine
Rosalie Tyler Paul, Maine
Charles Payne, Maine
Karen Peterson, New Mexico
Joshua Roy Pritchett, Florida
Virginia Rasmussen, New York
Richard Reisdorf, Minnesota
Carla and John Rensenbrink, Maine
Greta Rensenbrink and Kat Williams, West Virginia
Kathryn Rensenbrink and Jon McMillan, Maine
Liz Rensenbrink, Maine
Robert Richie and Cynthia Richie Terrell, Maryland
Barbara Rodgers-Hendricks, Florida
Kimberly Ruffin, Illinois
David Schwartzman, Washington D.C.
Evelyn Seberry, Michigan
Charles Sexton, Florida
Monica Schreiber, Oregon
Tammy Lacher Scully, Maine
Joseph Sirois, Maine
Mark and Wendy Skinner, Pennsylvania
William Slavick, Maine
Sam and Kathy Smith, Maine
James G. Speth, Vermont
Herschel Sternlieb, Maine
Dale Straugh, Illinois
Jeff and Shirley Taylor, Iowa
Lisa J. Taylor, California
Victoria A. Tredinnick and Brian Linson, New Jersey
Kathleen Vadnais, Minnesota
John C. Van Pelt, Maine
Rhoda Vanderhart, Alabama
Mike Wakefield, Maine
Andrea Walsh and Andy Davis, New Hampshire
Brielle Welzer, Maryland
Steve Welzer, New Jersey
David Whiteman, South Carolina
David and Regine Whittlesey, Maine
William T. Whitney, Maine
Natasha Wist, California
Peter and Margaret Zach, Maine
Steve M. and Marcia Zettle, Pennsylvania
Betty Zisk, Massachusetts
The Green Network, Missouri



Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 65
Brunswick, ME

GREEN HORIZON FOUNDATION
P.O. Box 476
TOPSHAM, ME 04086

