



Nebraskans for Peace

Nebraska Report

There is no Peace without Justice

MARCH/APRIL 2014

VOLUME 42, NUMBER 2

**“Climate change can now
be considered the world’s
largest Weapon of Mass
Destruction.”**

*Secretary of State John Kerry
February 16, 2014*

Nebraskans for Peace Phone:402-475-4620/Fax:475-4624
941 'O' St., Ste. 1026 nfpstate@nebraskansforpeace.org
Lincoln, NE 68508 www.nebraskansforpeace.org

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 310
Lincoln, NE

inside:

What We're Up To	p. 2	What's HOT in Global Warming?	p. 6
John Kerry's Speech on Climate Change	p. 3	A Journey Home to Earth	p. 7
Berkshire Hathaway Shareholder Resolution on Climate Change	p. 5	Judge Gives Anti-Nuclear Weapons Protestors a Way to Voice Their Cause	p. 8
		Ukrainian Neo-Nazism	p. 8
		Speaking Our Peace	p. 12

Nebraska Report

The Nebraska Report is published nine times annually by Nebraskans for Peace. Opinions stated do not necessarily reflect the views of the directors or staff of Nebraskans for Peace.

Newspaper Committee: Tim Rinne, Editor; Mark Vasina, Paul Olson
Typesetting and Layout: Michelle Ashley; Printing: Fremont Tribune
Website: Susan Alleman

Letters, articles, photographs and graphics are welcomed. Deadline is the first of the month for publication in the following month's issue. Submit to: Nebraska Report, c/o Nebraskans for Peace, 941 'O' Street, Suite 1026, Lincoln, NE 68508.

Nebraskans for Peace

NFP is a statewide grassroots advocacy organization working nonviolently for peace with justice through community-building, education and political action.

State Board of Directors

Kerry Beldin, A'Jamal Byndon, Frank Cordaro, Alicia Dallman, Henry D'Souza, Bob Epp, Tessa Foreman, Caryl Guisinger, Patrick Jones, Bill Laird, Frank LaMere, Rich Maciejewski, Rev. Jack McCaslin, Carol McShane, Patrick Murray, Paul Olson, Byron Peterson, Del Roper, Deirdre Routt, Linda Ruchala (Treasurer), Jay Schmidt, Shela Shanks (Secretary), Judy Sundeen, Ron Todd-Meyer (Vice President), Hank Van den Berg, Mark Vasina (President), Brian Whitecalf, Tim Rinne (State Coordinator); Brittany Crawford (Office & Fundraising Coordinator); Susan Alleman (Organization Administrator); 941 'O' Street, Suite 1026, Lincoln, NE 68508, Phone 402-475-4620, nfpstate@nebraskansforpeace.org; Mark Welsch (Omaha Coordinator), P.O. Box 6418, Omaha, NE 68106, Phone 402-453-0776, nfpomaha@nebraskansforpeace.org.

Moving? Change of Email Address?

NAME (print) _____
Old Address _____
City State _____ Zip _____
NEW ADDRESS _____
City State _____ Zip _____
New Phone # _____
NEW EMAIL _____

NFP Chapter & Affiliate Contact Information

Crete Chapter.....	Pat Wikel.....	402-826-4818
Lincoln Chapter.....	Paul Olson.....	402-475-1318
Omaha Chapter.....	Mark Welsch.....	402-453-0776
Scottsbluff Chapter.....	Byron Peterson.....	308-783-1412
Southwest Nebraska Chapter.....	Dennis Demmel.....	308-352-4078
Central Nebraska Peace Workers.....	Charles Richardson.....	402-462-4794

Contact the NFP State Office for information on the UNL, UNO, UNK, Creighton & Nebraska Wesleyan University and Hastings & Doane College Chapters

WHAT WE'RE UP TO

by Paul Olson & Tessa Foreman

The increasing danger of climate change has continued to occupy our attention—especially trying to wean our public power districts from coal, our cars from Big Oil, and our food system from an unsustainable, energy-intensive stranglehold. All of these factors contribute to an ever-warming climate. We have been somewhat successful in the Unicameral in spotlighting the economic and environmental costs of burning coal—and also in some public power districts (LES, OPPD) in promoting the development of local renewable energy. In the public arena, we have continued to oppose the tar sands pipeline and actively worked to increase food security by supporting local food production. Our efforts on urban agriculture, for instance, are garnering national attention, with the 'hamlet' gardening project that NFP State Board Treasurer Linda Ruchala and State Coordinator Tim Rinne helped create in their city block being featured in the April/May issue of *Mother Earth News*. This spring, NFP and the Nebraska Peace Foundation will be campaigning for the adoption of a shareholder resolution to reduce Berkshire Hathaway's carbon footprint at the company's Annual Shareholders Meeting May 3. Both the peace movement and the Pentagon recognize that climate change means competition for scarce resources, social upheaval and even outright war.

Our anti-war efforts have focused on the need for a nonviolent resolution of the Russian/Ukrainian crisis, using the UN to conduct elections and mediate border disputes in that troubled area. In the Middle East, we have advocated for the need to demilitarize the nuclear programs of both Israel and Iran at a public program in Lincoln and a Grand Island letter to the editor. The Omaha Chapter hosted Josh Reubner, an Israeli critic of the Obama Administration's failure to deliver on its promise to stop the settlements in Israel and develop a viable Palestine/Israel solution. On the heels of the release of Defense Secretary Hagel's military spending proposals, we issued a news release in favor of larger Pentagon budget cuts.

We have given testimony on a number of bills dealing with Corrections (LB 464, LB 907 and LB 999); contacted senators and organized support for LB 887 to expand Medicaid; worked to defeat LB 662, the voter suppression bill that has been killed in committee; and pushed for LB 943, to raise the minimum wage. This work has led to a significant number of legislative contacts, much legislative testimony, and a significant number of letters to the editor. The Grand Island Chapter has been particularly active in this area and on vigils on a variety of subjects. We have been churning out a stream of 'action alerts,' written testimony and contacts with senators on our legislative agenda.

In our efforts to reduce local violence, we have continued to make a few presentations on bullying and sexual and racist violence. We have lobbied for LB 485 to prohibit workplace sexual orientation discrimination. Susan Alleman, our membership coordinator, has worked closely with the "One Billion Rising" movement protesting violence against women. Similarly, Mark Vasina, our president, continues to work with efforts to prevent the illegal sale of alcohol to minors and intoxicated people in Whiteclay—a sale that contributes both of the destruction of health and to the increase of violence on the Pine Ridge Reservation. LGBT issues and expanding the peace park concept to public and church spaces to increase local understanding of human rights (particularly as regards human sexuality) have been a particular emphasis of the Grand Island Chapter.

Of course, we have to keep the machine running, and we have been busy at fundraising and increasing our membership. Our membership now stands between 1800 and 1900 individual members.

John Kerry's Speech on Climate Change

At a conference in Jakarta, Indonesia, February 16, Secretary of State John Kerry delivered the most forceful speech about the threat of climate change ever delivered by a White House official. Labeling climate change perhaps “the world’s most fearsome weapon of mass destruction,” Kerry exhorted the world community take action to contain this rapidly increasing peril. Reprinted below is an abridged version of his remarks.

It's a pleasure to be back in Indonesia—one of the richest ecosystems on earth. A country at the top of the global rankings for both marine and terrestrial biodiversity, and with a human ecosystem that includes 300 ethnic groups, speaking at least 700 languages.

But because of climate change, it's no secret that today, Indonesia is also one of the most vulnerable countries on Earth.

This year, I will engage in a series of discussions on the urgency of addressing climate change—particularly on the national security implications and the economic opportunities. But I wanted to start here, in Jakarta, because this city—this country—this region—is really on the front lines of climate change. It's not an exaggeration to say that the entire way of life here is at risk. So let's have a frank conversation about this threat and about what we, as citizens of the world, need to do to address it.

Some time ago I travelled to another vibrant city with its own rich history—Rio de Janeiro, Brazil—pretty much on the other side of the globe. I sat in a big room like this one, and I was surrounded by representatives from about 170 countries. We listened as expert after expert described the growing threat of climate change and what it would mean for the world, if we failed to act. The Secretary General of the conference, a man named Maurice Strong—an early leader on climate change—told us, “Every bit of evidence I've seen persuades me that we are on a course leading to tragedy.”

Well, that conference was in 1992. And it is stunning how little the conversa-



tion has changed since then.

When I think about the array of global threats we face today—terrorism, epidemics, poverty, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—all challenges that know no borders—climate change ranks right up there with them... The reason is simple: The science of climate change is leaping out at us like a scene from a 3D movie—warning us—compelling us to act.

And let there be no doubt that this science is conclusive. How conclusive? Well, when a ripe apple separates from a branch, it will fall to the ground. We know that because of basic laws of physics. And no one disputes that today. It's a fact.

Science also tells us that, when water hits a low enough temperature, it will turn into ice, and when it reaches a high enough temperature, it will boil. No one disputes that.

Science—and common sense—tells us that if you put your hand on a hot cook stove, you will get burned. I can't imagine anyone would dispute that, either.

So when thousands of the world's leading scientists and five reports from the UN tell us—over and over again—that our climate is changing, that it is happening faster than ever in recorded history, and that we humans are the significant cause, we need to listen.

When 97 percent of scientists agree

on anything, we need to listen and we need to respond.

Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists have confirmed that climate change is happening and that human activity is responsible. They agree on the causes of these changes and they agree on the potential effects.

They agree that the emission of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide contributes heavily to climate change. They agree that the energy sources we've relied on for decades to fuel our cars and power our homes—things like oil and coal—are largely responsible for sending those greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. They agree that emissions coming from deforestation and from agriculture also send enormous quantities of carbon pollution into our atmosphere.

And they agree that, if we continue down the same path we're on today, the world as we know it will change—and it will change dramatically for the worse.

So we know this is happening—and we know it with virtually the same certainty that we understand not to touch a hot stove.

In fact, this is not a complicated equation. Try and picture the thin layer of gases that makes up our atmosphere. For millions of years, we know that layer has acted like a thermal blanket

for the planet—trapping the sun's heat and warming the surface to the ideal life-sustaining temperature. Life itself on Earth exists because of the so-called greenhouse effect. But in modern times, as humans have emitted greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, that blanket has grown thicker, trapping more and more heat beneath it, raising the temperature of the planet. This is what's causing climate change. It's a huge irony is that very same layer of gases that has made life possible on Earth from the beginning now makes possible the greatest threat the planet has ever seen.

The results of our human activity are clear. If you ranked all the years in recorded history by average temperature, you'd see that eight of the 10 hottest years have all happened within the past decade. Or think about it this way: all 10 of the hottest years on record have actually happened since Google went online in 1998.

That's how fast this change is happening.

And because the earth is getting hotter at such an alarming speed, glaciers in places like the Arctic are melting into the sea faster than we ever anticipated. And the sea is rising to dangerous levels.

Scientists now predict that by the end of the century, the sea could rise a full meter. I know a meter may not sound like all that much, but just one meter is enough to put half of Jakarta under water. Just one meter would displace hundreds of millions of people worldwide and threaten billions in economic activity. It would put countless homes and schools and parks—entire cities and even countries—at risk.

Climate change also means the end of entire species. The changing sea temperature and increasing ocean acidification will mean that certain species of fish like cod and sardines can no longer live where they once thrived. This is devastating for the world's fisheries. And scientists predict that fisheries in Indonesia

continued on page 4

John Kerry, continued

will be among the hardest hit. Just think about the fishermen who sell their fresh catches at Pasar Ikan. There are some studies that say Indonesia's fisheries could actually lose up to 40 percent of what they currently bring in—so a fisherman who usually has about a hundred fish to sell in a day would instead come to the market with only 60 or so for sale. The impact is obvious. Climate change also means water shortages. Scientists predict that, because of changes in weather patterns, droughts could become longer and more intense. In fact, we're already seeing record droughts, and they're already putting a strain on water resources around the world. We've already seen conflicts erupt over limited water resources in parts of Africa. Back in the United States, President Obama just visited California, where millions of people are now experiencing the 13th month of the worst drought the state has seen in 500 years. And no relief is in sight.

Furthermore, climate change means fundamental transformations in agriculture worldwide. Scientists predict that, in some places, heat waves and water shortages will make it much more difficult for farmers to grow major staples like wheat, corn and rice. And obviously, it's not only farmers who suffer here—it's the millions who depend on the crops those farmers grow. For example, British government research shows that climate change may have contributed to the famine that killed as many as 100,000 people in Somalia back in 2010 and 2011.

And scientists further predict that climate change also means longer, more unpredictable monsoon seasons and more extreme weather events. Now we can't tell you whether any one storm is specifically caused by climate change, but scientists do predict many more of these disastrous storms will occur if we continue down our current path. Ladies and gentlemen, I saw with my own eyes what the Philippines experienced in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan and I will tell you: It would be absolutely devastating if that kind of storm were to become the norm.

On top of the unspeakable humanitarian toll, the economic cost that follows a storm like that is massive. I don't only mean the billions it costs to rebuild.

We've seen here in Asia how extreme weather events can disrupt world trade. For example, after serious flooding in 2011, global prices for external computer hard drives rose by more than 10 percent because electronic manufacturing zones around Bangkok were out of commission. So it's not just about agriculture—it's also about technology. It's about potentially catastrophic effects on the global supply chain.

Despite all of these realities—despite these facts—much of the world still doesn't see or want to see a need to pursue a significant response to this threat. As recently as 2011, a survey of city officials here in Asia found that more than 80 percent of them said they didn't anticipate climate change hurting their cities' economies.

And despite more than 25 years of scientific warning after scientific warning—despite the call to arms we heard in Rio back in 1992—we still haven't globally summoned the urgency necessary to get the job done. And as a result of this complacency, last year the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere reached the highest point in human history—despite all of the warnings.

Now, I know that these are some dramatic statistics. But think of it this way: If the worst case scenario never materializes, the steps that we are urging will still leave our air and water cleaner, our food supply more secure, and our populations healthier. Meanwhile, if 97 percent of scientists happen to be correct, and the naysayers are wrong, then we will have thwarted one of the gravest threats to our planet.

Notwithstanding the stark choices we face, there is still a window of time open for us to address this threat. But that window is closing. There is still time for us to significantly cut greenhouse emissions and prevent the very worst consequences of climate change from happening at all. But we need to move now.

We simply don't have time to let a few loud interest groups hijack the climate conversation anymore.

First and foremost, we should not allow a tiny minority of shoddy scientists and extreme ideologues to compete with scientific fact. Nor should we allow any room for those who think the costs associated with doing the right thing outweigh the benefits. And we certainly should not allow any more time to be wasted by those who want to sit around debating whose responsibility it is to deal with this threat, while we come closer and closer to the point of no return.

I have to tell you—this is really not a normal difference of opinion on an issue over which reasonable people can disagree. The science is unequivocal, and those who refuse to believe it are simply burying their heads in the sand. President Obama and I both believe that we don't have time for a meeting of the 'Flat Earth Society'.

One of the arguments we do hear is that it would be too expensive to address climate change. This assertion could not be less-grounded in fact. Serious analysts understand that costs of doing nothing far outweigh the costs of investing in solutions now. You don't need a degree in economics to understand that the costs of flooding, drought, famine, crop losses and more far outweigh the costs of addressing this challenge. Just look at a recent analysis conducted by the World Bank, which estimates that by 2050, losses from flood damage at Asian ports alone could exceed \$1 trillion annually—\$1 trillion every year—unless we make significant upgrades to infrastructure.

Finally, if we truly want to prevent the worst consequences of climate change from happening, we just don't have to waste debating whose responsibility it is to act. Because the answer is pretty simple: It's everyone's responsibility. Certainly some countries—including the United States—contribute more to the problem and therefore must also contribute more to the solution. But, ultimately, every nation on Earth has a responsibility to do its part if we have any hope of

Commander Calls Climate Change Biggest Threat to Asia-Pacific



Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III

The Asia-Pacific is the largest geographical region on the planet. Stretching from California to India and from the Arctic to Antarctica, it encompasses over half the earth's surface and serves as home to over half of the world's population. It is also the most militarized area in the world, with seven of the world's ten-largest standing militaries, the world's largest and most sophisticated navies, and five of the world's declared nuclear nations. So when the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command warns that climate change—not China, not North Korea—is the biggest long-term security threat in the Asia-Pacific region, heads perk up.

One year ago, four-star Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, caused a stir in Washington when he stated that climate change—"probably more than the other scenarios we all often talk about"—is the thing most likely to cripple the security environment. "If you look at how many people lost their lives or got hurt by any event [in the Asia-Pacific the past year], it wasn't through any kind of military activity. It was through natural disaster." Weather patterns, he noted, are unquestionably more severe than they have been in the past. And with melting polar ice, "You have the real potential here in the not-too-distant future of nations displaced by rising sea level."

It is imperative, Locklear said, that the U.S. get its military capabilities aligned for when the effects of climate change start to impact these massive populations. "If it goes bad, you could have hundreds of thousands or millions of people displaced and then security will start to crumble pretty quickly."

Berkshire Hathaway Shareholder Resolution on Climate Change

On May 4, 2013, as investors by the thousands poured into Omaha's CenturyLink Center for the Berkshire Hathaway Annual Shareholders Meeting, a handful of plucky NFP members braved the rain and cold to hold a banner that read: "Warren, The World Needs You To Lead — Speak Out About The Threat Of Climate Change."

*This coming May 3, at the 2014 Annual Shareholders Meeting, we'll be back back again with our banner. But this year, we'll not only be standing outside, our sister organization—the Nebraska Peace Foundation—will be **inside** as an official Berkshire Hathaway shareholder, to support a resolution calling for reducing BH's greenhouse gas emissions.*

RESOLVED:

That Berkshire Hathaway, Inc. ("Berkshire") establish reasonable, quantitative goals for reduction of greenhouse gas and other air emissions at its energy-generating holdings; and that Berkshire publish a report to shareholders by January 31, 2015 (at reasonable cost and omitting proprietary information) on how it will achieve these goals—including possible plans to retrofit or retire existing coal-burning plants at Berkshire-held companies.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT:

Berkshire Hathaway owns MidAmerican Energy Holdings ("MidAmerican"), whose subsidiaries have historically generated roughly 47 percent of their electricity burning coal. With appreciation for MidAmerican's recent investments in renewable generation, coal-burning plants continue to create liabilities.

Electricity generation accounts for more carbon dioxide ("CO₂") emissions than any other sector—more, even, than transportation or industry. U.S. fossil fuel-powered plants (like MidAmerican's) account for nearly 40 percent of domestic and 10 percent of global CO₂ pollution. Independent economists and scientists state that cutting greenhouse gas emissions in the near-term is far more cost-effective than paying for greenhouse gas-related damage in the future.

Therefore, it serves Berkshire shareholders to take proactive steps that avoid greenhouse gas emissions

and impending regulation. This is important to independent shareowners. In 2013, 34.4 percent of independent shareholders (shares not owned by Berkshire boardmembers or executive officers) ignored the Board's recommendation against this request for reasonable goals and thoughtful planning.



Some companies feel no qualms about reaping profits from coal-burning electricity plants while imposing the costs of pollution and harms to public health onto society at large ("externalizing" costs). But with Berkshire, externalizing costs of coal-burning subsidiaries can result in damage that boomerangs back on the company—in harm to employees at MidAmerican plants, and through claims paid by Berkshire insurance subsidiaries.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, under the Clean Air Act, now requires new or modified

electricity-generating plants to limit greenhouse gas emissions. They issued two significant rules, which together set stringent limits on a range of harmful emissions from power plants.

When both rules are fully enforced, Bernstein Research estimates that 15 percent of coal-fired power plants will be forced to close—unable to meet safety standards—or will require substantial new investment to remain viable.

Numerous peers to Berkshire's MidAmerican have established plans to replace coal-fired plants—including Calpine Corporation, Progress Energy, and Xcel Energy.

Other peers have set concrete targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions—including American Electric Power, Consolidated Edison, Duke Energy, Entergy, Exelon, and National Grid.

Still other peers have set greenhouse gas intensity targets—including CMS Energy, NiSource, Pinnacle West, and PSEG Power.

These forward-looking companies recognize that using natural gas, efficiency, and renewable energy are more profitable than retrofitting coal-fired plants—which are seen as being obsolete, inefficient, and highly polluting.

Following MidAmerican's investment in renewable generation assets, shareholders need amplification on Berkshire's overall plan to respond to climate disruption. Therefore, please vote FOR this reasonable request for planning.

Political Contacts

The White House
Washington, DC 20500
Comment Line: 202-456-1111
202-456-1414; Fax 202-456-2993
www.whitehouse.gov/contact/

Sen. Deb Fischer
383 Russell Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-6551
202-228-1325 (FAX)
402-391-3411 (Omaha)
402-441-4600 (Lincoln)
www.fischer.senate.gov

Sen. Mike Johanns
1 Russell Courtyard
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-4224
402-476-1400 (Lincoln)
402-434-4799 (Fax)
info@mikejohanns2008.com

Rep. Jeff Fortenberry, District 1
1517 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20515
202-225-4806
402-438-1598 (Lincoln)
<http://fortenberry.house.gov/>

Rep. Lee Terry, District 2
1524 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-4155; Fax 202-226-5452
402-397-9944 (Omaha)
<http://leeterry.house.gov/>

Rep. Adrian Smith, District 3
503 Cannon House Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-6435; Fax 202-225-0207
888-ADRIAN7 (Toll Free)
<http://www.adriansmith.house.gov/>

Capitol Hill 202-224-3121
State Capitol 402-471-2311
State Senator, District #
State Capitol; PO Box 94604
Lincoln, NE 68509-4604

Governor Dave Heineman
PO Box 94848
Lincoln, NE 68509-4848
402-471-2244; Fax 402-471-6031
gov.state.ne.us

What's HOT in Global Warming?

by Professor Bruce E. Johansen

The Coming Revolution in Solar Energy

Rather than fill the atmosphere with carbon dioxide and our oceans with spilled oil, more energy has been going into paradigm-changing developments in solar energy. These are taking science in some amazing directions, some of which will soon be coming to a roof, door or window near you.

Solar power has advanced

building a 'power tower,' a tall structure flanked by thousands of mirrors, each of which pivots to focus light on the tower, heating fluid.

A breakthrough in solar power has been sought since the days of Thomas Edison. In a conversation with Henry Ford and the tire tycoon Harvey Firestone in

chemical bonds, possibly (with further development) providing a practical, inexpensive source of solar energy. The device was described by Robert F. Service in *Science* as "a silicon wafer about the size and shape of a playing card. Different catalysts coat each side of the wafer. The silicon absorbs sunlight and passes that

have been developed, but they were very expensive.

Nocera by early 2011 had developed an inexpensive catalyst that uses three different metals. He did not name the metals, pending patents and publication. Nocera said in 2011 that he hoped to have the technology operable on a commercial scale within two to three years with the aid of his company, Sun Catalytix. Nocera has plans to join with Ratan Tata, chair of Tata Group of India, to produce a power plant the size of a refrigerator that will manufacture electric power from sunlight and water to provide inexpensive energy to large numbers of people who presently have no access to power.

on consumption. The homes have smart meters that feed surplus energy into the electrical grid, running backwards when kilowatts are being credited.

Dow-Jones, Inc. in 2010 said it expected to install a 4.1 megawatt solar power system at its 200-acre New Brunswick, N.J. campus within a year. It would be one of the largest single commercial solar sites in the United States. Dow-Jones expects the site to pay for itself within three years. The solar plant will cover 230,000 square feet of parking lots. The solar array will provide 15 percent of the energy used by 2,000 people on the campus; up to 50 percent at peak use, morning 'high sun.'

A solar power breakthrough has been sought since Thomas Edison's day. In 1931, shortly before he died, he said, "I'd put my money on the sun and solar energy. I hope we don't have to wait until oil and coal run out before we tackle that."



significantly since the days of inefficient photovoltaics. In California, solar power is being built into roof tiles, and talk is that nanotechnology will someday make any surface the sun hits a source of power—windows, for example. Experiments have been undertaken with a new form of solar energy—Concentrating Solar Power (CSP), a parabola-shaped mirror that focuses light onto a black pipe with a heat-transfer fluid inside. The fluid is used to boil water into steam, which turns a generator. The newest solar-thermal technology involves

1931, shortly before Edison died, he said: "I'd put my money on the sun and solar energy. What a source of power! I hope we don't have to wait until oil and coal run out before we tackle that," according to Andrew Revkin, in the *New York Times*.

An Artificial Leaf

About 2010, for the first time, a team of researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) led by Daniel Nocera created the prototype of an 'artificial leaf' that can replicate the way plants use sunlight to knit

energy to the catalysts to split water (H₂O) into molecules of hydrogen (H₂) and oxygen (O₂). The hydrogen then may be used in a fuel cell, re-emerging as water.

Although practical application is a ways off, "It's spectacular," said Robert Grubbs, a chemist at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, after watching a demonstration of the process at a meeting of the American Chemical Society. The MIT team previously developed a catalyst that used cobalt and phosphorous to break water at the molecular level and knit oxygen atoms into O₂ molecules. Hydrogen-forming catalysts also

Solar Spreads in Homes, Offices

By 2011, major builders were beginning to sell mid-range tract houses with installed solar power and utility bills close to zero. In some sunny areas, including Tucson, Arizona and Las Vegas, Nevada, houses were being sold by Arizona-based Meritage Homes, the ninth-largest residential construction company in the United States, for \$140,000 to \$170,000, which produce as much energy as they consume. The homes come with a nine-panel solar array that reduces electric bills by about one-third. For \$10,000 more, 24 more panels reduce power bills to zero, more or less—depending

New Technologies

The silicon solar panels that dominate the industry today may be replaced by new technologies that combine several light-absorbing materials that capture different portions of the solar spectrum, or solar cells manufactured in rolls of thin copper-indium film gallium selenide atop a metal foil. Nanotechnology plays a role in some designs for future solar-generating technology that is been theorized, but not yet commercialized. While today's silicon cells convert about 15 to 20 percent of sunlight to electricity in the field (up to 24 percent under perfect

A Journey Home To Earth

Roy Guisinger is CIO of the Nebraska Food Cooperative and lead developer of the Open Food Source software that powers dozens of local food cooperatives around the world.



Roy Guisinger

I was born in an alien land.

Growing up in Los Angeles in the 1960s, one of the largest cities on Earth at the time, I didn't have much interest in agriculture. I thought of food as a manufactured product that came into the world much as radios and automobiles. I figured it was assembled in a factory somewhere, even though I probably knew better at some level. Farmers were the people who worked in those food-factories, and their industry didn't interest me much. As the son of a rocket scientist, all that mushy stuff on my dinner plate wasn't nearly as cool as airplanes, satellites, or the "Eagle" that had just landed on the moon.

Strangely, my father the rocket scientist—and you thought I was joking—was originally an Iowa farm-boy. He eventually brought his family back to the farm, albeit in Oregon, so I also had the experience of growing up with cows, goats, chickens and a home garden. But, somehow, I still didn't really understand how that all fit into my world.

When I graduated from high school, I set off to conquer the world—with technology—just like all my childhood heroes had done.

I desperately wanted to make the world a better place, but I figured that would be done with science and gadgets and technical know-how. I studied physics, mechanical engineering, nuclear energy, and I learned to program computers, even while the Internet was gaining a foothold in the world. But I also started spending time with people who touted the virtue of organic food, shopped locally, knew about composting and saved seeds. I thought their 'granola' attitudes were interesting, but not particularly important.

Shortly after I met my wife, we moved to a small acreage in Nebraska. Honestly, I had only a vague idea that Nebraska was somewhere in the middle of the country.

And thus began my long journey home.

So, what does a techno-geek like me do in rural Nebraska? He gets involved in agriculture, of course. We did all the normal rural things: raised a flock of chickens, grew a big garden, composted kitchen waste, etc. But my heart still wasn't entirely into it. Then, along came Bob Waldrop from the Oklahoma Food Cooperative to explain at an NSAS conference (Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society) how they were distributing local food to Oklahomans through a web portal. For me, this was the really important connection: using technology to make agriculture work better; that was something I could understand.

So, about a year later, I joined a group of Nebraskans, dedicated to the idea of local and sustainably-raised food, and we started the Nebraska Food Cooperative (NFC). Like the Oklahoma model, NFC is a year-round on-line farmers' market. Producers—many of them small family farmers—list their products on the website at www.nebraskafood.org. Then, guided by detailed information about the growing practices of farmers and ranchers, our members order local food on-line. Every two weeks, the cooperative dispatches a truck to pick up products at the farm gates, saving

producers time and expense of attending a bazaar-style farmers' market. Food is then delivered to locations in a number of Nebraska communities for customers to pick up. Now, after almost eight years of operation, membership in the cooperative is growing faster than ever before and the site is moving about \$10,000 of food every month.

Fundamentally, the idea behind the cooperative is to simplify the process of matching food producers with food consumers, make it easy for people to 'virtually' know their farmer, and to find and purchase local food in all seasons of the year. As a developer of the software that runs that system, I have been privileged to help over two-dozen similar organiza-

is an illusion we humans have created by structuring our world for convenience and by the mechanical precision with which food appears on store shelves. As in my youth, living in a city where fingers never dig into the soil and bring forth something edible is like living in a dream where everything magically happens just outside our view. It might be nice, but it simply isn't real.

As a species, we have achieved great technological marvels; we have landed on the moon and sent machines out of the solar system. Yet we remain very natural creatures on the inside. Anyone living solely in a world of technological artifacts is no longer living in a real world. Fortunately, you don't need to actually leave the city, as I did. Local food is important, not just because it has



tions around the world get started. This has been my personal solution to the nature-technology dichotomy.

My journey home, of course, is a reference to my own human relationship with the environment, of which agriculture is a large part. Food is as central to our survival as water and air. It has been said, "You are what you eat," and, "Eating is an agricultural act." So the notion I carried with me for most of my life—that food production is not important—was simply naïve.

'Coming home' means leaving behind the false sense of separation between the growing part of the earth and the living part of ourselves. The idea that we are independent of the natural world

been picked fresher, tastes better, uses less petroleum to reach your table, and stimulates the local economy, but because it forces us to appreciate a closer connection with the land. The exercise of buying local food puts us into communication with farmers, attunes us to the seasonal cycles, and dispels some part of the illusion that we are somehow not dependent upon the growing world.

Luckily, we can have it both ways: technology and nature. I still prefer spending my energy in technical pursuits rather than tending crops and animals, but I am privileged because I get to do both. Moreover, I have found my connection with the growing, life-giving part of the world. I have come home in Nebraska.

Judge Gives Anti-Nuclear Weapons Protestors a Way to Voice Their Cause

by Barb and Hank Van den Berg

On July 13, 2013, 24 "PeaceWorks-KC" protesters were arrested for trespassing after they crossed the property line of the National Nuclear Security Administration's Kansas City Plant in Missouri. This new five-building facility makes 85 percent of the components that go into U.S. nuclear weapons, according to defense contractor Honeywell. The anti-nuclear protesters included priests, sisters, Catholic Workers and other peace activists from both the Kansas City and Des Moines areas. Some of the arrested pleaded not guilty, some refused to pay court fees, and several requested a jury trial in order to share their nonviolent message with a jury of their peers.

On December 13, 2013, eight of the arrested came before a court in Kansas City, Missouri. Presiding was Judge Ardie Bland. He stated in court, "I volunteered to take this case because I've done this before with Mr. Stoever, and I find it interesting. If you're not getting to anyone else, you're getting to me. I think you're educating, because every time I learn something." Judge Bland is sympathetic to the need to question laws from his study of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States.

During the trial, the defense lawyer, Henry Stoever, asked each defendant to explain why they entered the property of the nuclear weapons plant. Their answers emphasized the immorality of causing pain and suffering, the inevitability of death and destruction, the right to disobey immoral laws, and the desire to never repeat a Hiroshima or Nagasaki. Trespassing was motivated by the defendants' conscience and a profound sense of the wrongness of nuclear weapons.

There were many notable testimonies from the trial. Kendrea White, the prosecutor for the City of Kansas asked Father Carl Kabat: "Should you obey rules?" Father Carl responded: "If the rules are wrong, we should disobey them. We each have our own conscience to follow. If there was a gas chamber across the street, I would say that we should all go out and destroy it!"

Henry Stoever, attorney for the defendants, commented to Father Jerry Zawada, "Fr. Jerry,

you're no Johnny-come-lately. In 1988, you came before federal Judge Joseph Stevens three times for resisting the Minuteman II missiles in Missouri." Father Jerry immediately corrected him: "Five times. I came before Judge Stevens five times." Father Jerry then continued: "We must transform our preoccupation with nuclear weapons. We need to become people of conscience."

Judge Bland then asked: "Becoming a 'people of conscience' means causing destruction to missile silos?" Father Jerry answered, "I would want to propose alternatives to missile silos." Judge Bland teased Father Jerry when he asked: "I just wanted to know if I was going to see you again in a few weeks?" Father Jerry replied: "If this is an invitation, I accept it." The court room burst out in laughter.

Two other defendants, Betsy Keenan and Georgia Walker, sited the contamination of Kansas City from the nuclear weapons plant in their testimonies. Georgia Walker stated, "I have two aunts who worked at the IRS office at the Bannister Federal Complex, where the current nuclear weapons parts plant has been since 1949. My two aunts died at ages 61 and 62 from

'strange' cancers. Now, the federal government gives Honeywell a new place to devastate. Of 650 claims concerning workers' compensation, only 75 workers have been compensated. Stand up against injustice. Don't repeat the same mistake of endangering employees at the new plant."

Henry Stoever repeated the moral issues brought up by the defendants by concluding, "These weapons indiscriminately kill noncombatants, civilians, all life. Everybody is ignoring the elephant, or rather the monster in the room. It's a moral imperative to oppose nuclear weapons. I think it is also a legal imperative."

At the end of the proceedings, Judge Bland called the defendants towards the bench. He announced that he had no choice but to find them guilty of trespassing. But, instead of jail time or community service, he surprised the court by sentencing each of the defendants to write answers to six questions that came to him during this trial. Judge Bland said, "Your responses will be attached to the court record, which is a public record. They will exist as long as Kansas City exists. My way will give you a chance to say what you want to say." The

sentence was considered a just outcome for the nuclear weapons resisters, the court room erupted in applause and cheers, and many people lined up to shake hands with Judge Bland. Defendant Bix Bichsel repeated his satisfaction with the sentence by adding this comment to his written answers: "Through your conscientious judgments you are guiding your court to be a sanctuary of justice-dealing for all people. Thank you for your judgment."

Questions 1-3 address the issue of nuclear weapons as a defensive military policy and pose 'what if' scenarios that suggest that the defendants might have a change of opinion if nuclear weapons were released upon the United States. Here is the exact wording of Judge Bland's six questions:

1. If North Korea, China or one of the Middle Eastern countries dropped a nuclear bomb on a U.S. city tomorrow, would that change your opinion about nuclear weapons?
2. If Germany or Japan had used nuclear weapons first in World War II, do you think that would have changed your opinion?
3. What would you say to those who say, "If we [the U.S.] do not have the big stick, that is, if we get rid of our nuclear weapons, and other countries develop nuclear weapons, then we do not have the opportunity to fight back"?

In their testimonies in court, many of the defendants spoke of their religion influencing their anti-nuclear weapons stand. Judge Bland therefore sought further clarifications on God, religious beliefs, and law in questions 4-6.

4. You defendants say you are Christians and one is a Buddhist. Fr. [Carl] Kabat says that you should disobey godly laws. How do you respond to someone who believes there is no God? Who is to say what God believes, for example, when Christians used God to justify slavery and the Crusades?
5. How do you respond to those who have a God different from you when they argue that their religion is to crush others into dust?

6. Who determines what 'God's law' is, given the



Ann Suellentrop waves to fellow anti-nuclear weapons protesters as police arrest her for trespassing on the National Nuclear Security Administration's new weapons plant in Kansas City, Missouri, July 13, 2013.

John Kerry, conclusion

leaving our future generations the safe and healthy planet they deserve.

You have a saying here in Indonesia, “Luka di kaki, sakit seluruh badan”. It means “when there’s a pain in the foot, the whole body feels it.” Today, in this interconnected world, hardship anywhere is felt by people everywhere. When a massive storm destroys village after village in Southeast Asia; when crops that used to grow abundantly no longer turn a profit for farmers in South America; when entire communities are forced to relocate because of rising tides—it’s not just one country or even one region that feels the pain. In today’s globalized economy, the entire world feels it.

When you think about it, it’s no different than how we confront other global threats.

Think about terrorism. We don’t decide to have one country to beef up its airport security while the others relax their standards and let bags on board without inspection. That clearly wouldn’t make us any safer.

Or think about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It doesn’t keep us safe if the United States secures its nuclear arsenal, while other countries fail to prevent theirs from falling into the wrong hands. We all have to approach that challenge together.

Bottom line: It’s the same thing with climate change. And in a sense, climate change can now be considered the world’s largest weapon of mass destruction.

I mentioned earlier that last December I went to Tacloban in the Philippines, not long after Typhoon Haiyan. I have to tell you: I’ve never seen devastation like

that in my life. We saw cars, homes, and lives turned upside-down, trees scattered like toothpicks along the mountainside. And most devastating of all, the storm killed more than 5,000 people—men, women, and children who never saw it coming.

The fact is that climate change, if left unchecked, will wipe many more communities from the face of the earth.

That’s unacceptable under any circumstances—but even more so because we know what we need to do to avoid that fate.

It is time for the world to approach this problem with the cooperation, urgency, and commitment that a challenge of this scale warrants. It’s absolutely true that industrialized countries have to play a leading role in reducing emissions, but that doesn’t mean other nations have the right to repeat the mistakes of the past. It’s not enough for one country or even a few countries to reduce emissions when other countries continue to fill the atmosphere with carbon pollution as they see fit. At the end of the day, emissions coming from anywhere threaten the future for people everywhere.

Now, as I already acknowledged, I’m the first to recognize that the United States contributed significantly to this problem. And I also recognize the responsibility we have to erase the bad habits we adopted before we fully understood the consequences...

But the United States cannot solve this problem or foot this bill alone. Even if every single American biked to work or carpooled to school, and used only solar panels to power their homes—if we each planted a dozen trees—if we somehow

Climate change means water shortages. We’re already seeing record droughts—and conflicts erupting over limited water resources in parts of Africa. Back in the United States, millions of people in California are now experiencing the 13th month of the worst drought the state has seen in 500 years. And no relief is in sight.

eliminated all of our domestic greenhouse gas emissions—guess what? That still wouldn’t be enough to counteract the carbon pollution coming from the rest of the world. Because today, if even one or two major economies neglects to respond to this threat, it will counteract all of the good work that the rest of the world does. When I say we need a global solution, I mean it.

That is why the United States is prepared to take the lead in bringing other nations to the table. This is something President Obama is deeply committed to. And as Secretary of State, I’m personally committed to making sure this work is front and center in our diplomatic efforts. This week I will be instructing the Chiefs of Mission at American embassies all over the world to make climate change a top priority and to use all the tools of diplomacy they have at their disposal to address this threat...

I’m well aware that these aren’t easy choices for any country to make—especially for developing nations. Coal and oil are cheap ways to power a society, at least in the near term. But I urge governments around the world to look further down the road. They can’t simply factor in the cost of immediate energy needs.

They have to factor in the long-term cost of carbon pollution. They have to factor in the cost of survival. And if they do, they will find that the cost of pursuing clean energy now is far cheaper than paying for the consequences of climate change later...

Today I call on all of you here in Indonesia and concerned citizens around the world to demand that resolve from your leaders. Speak out. Make climate change an issue that no public official can ignore another day. Make a transition toward clean energy the only plan you’ll accept.

If we come together now, we can not only meet this challenge, we can create jobs and economic growth in every corner of the globe. We can clean up the air our families breathe and make our neighborhoods healthier places to live. We can help ensure farmers and fishers can still make a sustainable living and feed our communities. We can avoid disputes and even entire wars over oil, water and other limited resources. And we can make good on the moral responsibility we all have to leave our children a planet that is clean and healthy and sustainable for decades to come.

history of the USA and the world?

On January 22, 2014, lawyer Henry Stoeber submitted the defendants’ written answers. The “what if” type questions 1-3 did not change their opinions about nuclear weapons and they did not waiver in their belief of the immorality of nuclear weapons.

Among the noteworthy passages from the defendants’ answers is Father Kabat’s reference to key legal opinions. For example, he

cites Judge Christopher Weeramanty’s opinion from the 1996 World Court of Justice, who said “...the use of nuclear weapons is illegal in any circumstances whatsoever. It violates the fundamental principles of international law, and represents the very negation of the humanitarian concerns which underlie the structure of humanitarian law. It offends conventional law and, in particular, the Geneva Gas Protocol of 1925, and Article 23(a) of the Hague Regula-

tions of 1907. The use or threat of use of nuclear weapons contradicts the fundamental principle of the dignity and worth of the human person on which all law depends. It endangers the human environment in a manner which threatens the entirety of life on the planet.”

In answer to the first question, Jane Stoeber emphasized the contamination from the Kansas City nuclear weapons plant. There

is suffering from not only victims from bombing, but also from the people who work in the manufacturing plants for these weapons. Siting various local news reports, she wrote that a “4/13/2011 list from NBC Action News, Channel 41 in Kansas City, includes 154 persons who family members said had died from exposure

conclusion on page 10

Weapons Protestors, conclusion

to the [Bannister Federal] complex's contaminants, and about 250 additional persons who said they were ill because of exposure to the contaminants." Other information from the same report indicates that nearly 900 toxins have been found in the complex, including beryllium, asbestos and plutonium.

Georgia Walkers' answers to question number 2 and 3 are forceful. "My opposition to nuclear weapons would not have been diminished if any other country had been first to use them. The point is that using devastating weapons of mass destruction against any country is a crime not because of who perpetrated the act but because of what the act accomplished. Vaporizing humans and all living things with an atomic bomb is an act of moral depravity no matter which country does it or for what reasons it is executed. A crime is a crime... The countries which possess nuclear weapons are holding the whole world hostage with the fear and trembling that these weapons could destroy the entire planet through evil intent or careless accident. This is a great injustice which must be resisted with every ounce of courage that we can muster!"

An individual's conscience was a major theme in many of the defendants' answers. Lauren Logan wrote that in reference to God's law, "It is not the point of God or his law. It's not politics or history or anything else that has brought me to the decision that nuclear war needs to be forever destroyed; it was listening to my conscience, something we all have, and realizing that anything that can be so detrimental to our world... is bad!"

Many of the defendants answered questions with quotes from Martin Luther King Jr. In commenting on law, Jane Stoeber used this quote from Dr. King's "Letter from Birmingham City Jail": "You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws... There are two types of law: just and unjust... One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that 'an unjust law is not law at all.'"

Father Jerry Zawada quoted Attorney Bill Quigley, his friend and a law professor very much respected throughout the judicial world:

"There is a difference between Laws and Justice. Laws must be continuously reinterpreted and changed as understanding and circumstances progress in order to ensure Justice (which is the objective)."


William J. "Bix" Bichsel's answer to question four expanded upon God's law by writing: "Whether a person believes in God or not, there are secular codes of human conduct such as the Declaration of Human Rights which mesh and agree with the tenets of varying religious traditions. These rights and a body of international law form a juridical and humanitarian basis for the judging and safeguarding of humanity and human conduct."

There is no doubt that members of Nebraskans for Peace who have been involved in similar anti-nuclear weapons protests, would consider this unusual punishment given by Judge Ardie Bland as a great step forward in the judicial system's understanding of the meaning and purpose of nonviolent civil disobedience. It is important that the defendants' answers have been made part of the court record. Hopefully Judge Bland's wisdom will impact the way other law enforcement organizations handle peaceful protests.

And the anti-nuclear weapons protests will continue as part of PeaceWorksKC upcoming actions which they call the "Trifecta Resista 2014." On Sunday, May 31, 2014, there will be another action at the Bannister Federal Complex, the old National Nuclear Security Administration's nuclear weapons parts plant and site of serious contamination. That evening after the action, nationally known peace activists, including Kathy Kelly from "Voices for Creative Nonviolence" and Medea Benjamin from "Code Pink" will speak. Find more information at <http://peaceworkskc.org>. This article borrowed from the following:

Megan Fincher, "Trial of Anti-nuclear Activists Ends with Unusual Sentence," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 3-16, 2014, p.1 and 16 and the online version at <http://ncronline.org/news/peace-justice/trial-anti-nuclear-activists-ends-unusual-sentence>.

Lu Mountenay, "Judge Calls 9 Nuke Resisters Guilty but Surprises Them with Sentence," is most easily accessible by going to <http://peaceworkskc.org>.

	NOW SHOWING
	COMING SOON
	ABOUT THE ROSS
	MEMBERSHIP
	SPONSORS
	FILM RESOURCES
CONTACT US	
MARY RIEPMA ROSS MEDIA ARTS CENTER	ADMISSION: \$8.50 General Admission \$7.00 Students \$6.50 Seniors \$6.00 Members \$5.50 Children Matinee \$6.50 General Admission \$5.50 Seniors \$5.00 Members \$5.50 Children Children are 12 and under, Seniors are 60 and older We accept cash, check, NCard, Visa, and Mastercard Box Office Opens 30 Minutes Before Showtimes
UNIVERSITY OF Nebraska Lincoln HIXSON-LIED COLLEGE OF FINE & PERFORMING ARTS	LOCATION: 313 N. 13 STREET LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

COMING SOON

Fri, Mar 28 - Thu, Apr 24
THE GRAND BUDAPEST HOTEL
Wes Anderson

Fri, Mar 28 - Thu, Apr 3
ELAINE STRITCH: SHOOT ME
Chiemi Karasawa

Fri, Apr 4 - Thu, Apr 10
THE FACE OF LOVE
Arie Posin

Fri, Apr 11 - Thu, Apr 24
THE UNKNOWN KNOWN
Erols

Fri, Apr 25 - Thu, May 1
PARTICLE FEVER
Mark Levinson, David Kaplan

Fri, Apr 25 - Thu, May 1
THE LUNCHBOX
Ritesh Batra

Fri, May 2 - Thu, May 8
ERNEST & CELESTINE
Stéphane Aubier

Fri, May 2 - Thu, May 8
FINDING VIVIAN MAIER
John Maloof, Charlie Siskel

Fri, May 9 - Thu, May 15
IT FELT LIKE LOVE
Eliza Hittman

What's HOT, conclusion

laboratory conditions), new technologies that have broached the realm of theory (and some in design, but not commercialization) raise that figure to 40, 60 even 80 percent. Photovoltaics made of plastic may dramatically reduce manufacturing costs.

The cost of solar power has been declining sharply, from \$22 per watt in 1980, to \$6 per watt in 1990, and \$2.70 in 2005. Economies of scale, as well as improvements in efficiency and less expensive construction materials may bring solar energy down to cost that competes with fossil-fuel generation by about 2015.

A new Clean Energy Institute, started in 2013 at the University of Washington with \$6 million in state funding, is studying a wide range of improvements in solar energy. One possibility is solar cells made of plastic that are easy and cheap to manufacture. Another proposal involves solar 'inks' that can be spread on a wide variety of surfaces to generate solar energy. Another uses copper, zinc, tin and

sulfide—all inexpensive and abundant materials—in solar cells whose efficiency has been dramatically improved during the last few years.

SOURCES

Kintisch, Eli. "Light-Splitting Trick Squeezes More Electricity Out of Sun's Rays." *Science* 317(August 3, 2007):583-584.

Long, Katherine. "UW Flips Switch on Clean Energy Institute." *Seattle Times*, December 13, 2013, B-4.

Revkin, Andrew C. "Budgets Falling in Race to Fight Global Warming." *New York Times*, October 30, 2006. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/30/business/worldbusiness/30energy.html>]

Service, Robert F. "Solar Power: Can the Upstarts Top Silicon?" *Science* 319(February 8, 2008):718-720.

Service, Robert F. "Artificial Leaf Turns Sunlight Into a Cheap Energy Source." *Science* 332(April 1, 2011): 25. [DOI:10.1126/science.332.6025.25]

Bruce E. Johansen is Jacob J. Isaacson Professor at the UNO and author of The Encyclopedia of Global Warming Science and Technology (2009).

Speaking Our Peace, conclusion

need for buffering—both from invasion and economic instability. Russia (as the Soviet Union) lost 30 million people in the European conflicts of World Wars I and II, over a hundred times as many as the U.S. lost, and modern historians credit the U.S.S.R. with the heavy lifting in winning the Second World War. The European Union was the group that, for no good reason, required that the Ukraine choose between Russia and the West. Buffers were needed when Czarist Russia had to contend with Napoleon's invasion, when U.S. and European invasion forces supported the White Russians and Mensheviks, and when Hitler's invasion forces destroyed millions. They are needed now.

Indeed, the Iron Curtain, tyranny that it enclosed, was designed to provide the U.S.S.R. a buffer against European incursion. Even after the fall of the Soviets, when I lectured in Moldova in 1996, the people clearly understood the danger of moving too close to the West. (Americans forget that we've had the whole Western hemisphere as a buffer since the "Monroe Doctrine," that we invaded Grenada to protect a very few American students that did not need protection, and that the very European Union that now offers close affiliation to the Ukraine takes its leadership from Russia's historic nemeses: France and Germany.)

Since 1991, Russia has lost almost all of its buffers, the Balkan Peninsula, Hungary, the Czechoslovak area, Poland, the Balkan states and Finland. Is Ukraine, once the Russian nation's agricultural heartland, next? For comparison, how would Americans feel about giving the Great Plains to Mexico?

Many Russians believe their country's misery after the Soviet Union's collapse, its poverty under Boris Yeltsin's oligarchs, was ignored and/or relished by the West. They also believe that the creation of the European Union and NATO—with their efforts at the assimilation of the Ukraine—is a step toward recreating the misery of Yeltsin's time, even if they do not accept the allegation that the Ukraine's movement toward the European Union was sponsored

by the CIA and Western corporations. In fact, when a 2009 Gallup poll asked Ukrainians whether they saw NATO as a threat or protection for Ukraine, 40 percent saw NATO as a threat, 17 percent saw NATO as protection, and 33 percent saw NATO as neither.

A Russia on its knees is far more dangerous than a Russia rebuilding—just as a chaotic 1920s-early '30s Germany destroyed by inflation and chaos within was more dangerous than would have been a Germany creating a civil society. Europe needs to pull back from absorbing more of Russia's buffer states into the European Union. Ukraine appears to have pulled back from seeking integration into NATO. NATO should perhaps pull back from its present boundaries. We need to concentrate on helping Russia create stable civic institutions.

Of course, Putin is wrong. He is himself an oligarch and the authoritarian arbiter among the oligarchs who rule his domain (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/31/opinion/russias-oligarchy-alive-and-well.html?_r=0). Bribery is the primary mode of governing in his realm. He has also committed plenty of sins against the peace movement's Tolstoyan efforts to achieve peace—in Chechnya, in South Ossetia, in Abkhazia, in Georgia and in his dealing with Yanukovich in the Ukraine. However, he has promised that he will not seek to absorb the Ukraine, not even the Russian-dominated eastern Ukraine.

Of course, the Ukraine needs to be respected. Of course it needs food and economic help and UN observers. But, most of all, it needs neutrality in order to take on the moderating middle position that geopolitics requires it to occupy. Nebraskans for Peace has asked that the outstanding issues of concern in the Ukrainian area be presented to the UN General Assembly for full international discussion and mediation.

The kind of misery that Tolstoy saw at Sevastopol and that propelled him to found the modern peace movement needs to be remembered, particularly now when the stakes at risk are far greater than at the time of the Crimean War.

Ukrainian Neo-Nazism

Haaretz, the liberal Israeli newspaper, has tracked evidence of anti-Semitism within the Ukraine's new leadership. In the February 25 edition, the paper noted that, "Over the last few weeks, as law and order broke down in Kiev and other cities, there has been a rise in attacks on Jews which has barely gone noticed in the wider story of the Independence Square revolution."

It went on to ask whether the beatings are harbingers of pogroms: "At least three beatings of Jews and two vandalism attacks on synagogues have taken place in central Kiev, not far from the anti-Yanukovich demonstrations. And it has spread further afield—this week there was a report of a Molotov cocktail attack on a synagogue and Jewish community center in Zaporozhye, in southeastern Ukraine."

Given the anti-Semitic tendencies of the rightist parties, *Haaretz* worried that it will be quite easy at rallies to urge attacks on Jews and Jewish synagogues:

The greatest worry now is not the uptick in anti-Semitic incidents but the major presence of ultra-nationalist movements, especially the prominence of the "Svoboda" party and "Right Sector" members among the demonstrators. [These parties are now in the government.] Many of them are calling their political opponents "Zhids" and flying flags with neo-Nazi symbols. There have also been reports, from reliable sources, of these movements distributing freshly translated editions of Mein Kampf and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion in Independence Square [in Kiev].

About 30 percent of the revolutionary group seems to be made up of

neo-Nazis, *Haaretz* reported March 19. While some of their attacks on Jews may have been fomented by Russia to discredit the revolution, the newspaper stated that is by no means the entire story:

This is a country that both idolizes and condemns a former leader who collaborated with the Nazis—Stepan Bandera. He is denounced by many Ukrainians and Jewish groups for mass killings, but he is also beloved for refusing to rescind the proclamation of an independent Ukrainian state in 1941. In the past, Ukrainian Jews suffered pogroms and government-sanctioned persecution, and anti-Semitism is still a threat... [In the demonstrations,] armed and masked protesters brandished nationalist symbols linked with the fascism of yesteryear. These included the Celtic cross, which has replaced the swastika for many modern white-power groups, and the wolf-hook SS insignia. There was also the symbol 14/88. The 14 represents a 14-word slogan used by white nationalists, and the 88 stands for "Heil Hitler"—'H' is the eighth letter of the alphabet. Finally, there was the Black Sun occult symbol, with which the Third Reich adorned a castle hall. Some Right Sector protesters on the Maidan sported yellow armbands with the wolf hook symbol revealing their specific political party affiliation—that of the Social National Assembly (SNA), a largely Kiev-based neo-Nazi organization. Other more openly anti-Semitic parties are White Hammer and C14, the neo-Nazi youth wing of the Svoboda party.

This is very disturbing.

— Paul A. Olson

Carlton B. Paine, Ph.D. • Clinical Psychologist

5625 'O' Street, Suite 7 • Lincoln, NE 68510 • Phone: 402-489-8484

Your Foundation Speaks

by Loyal Park, Nebraska Peace Foundation President

Give to Lincoln Day will be Thursday, May 29th this year. This is the third year your Nebraska Peace Foundation will be participating with Lincoln Community Foundation for this promotion of Lincoln-based nonprofit organizations.

Lincoln Community Foundation promotes this one day of philanthropic giving by adding money to each donation from their challenge match pool of \$300,000.00. Gifts received on that one day of May 29th, will be matched proportionally based on dollars raised by each nonprofit.

There will be more information coming out in the weeks before **Give to Lincoln Day** so be on the lookout for information and updates.



BULLETIN BOARD

March 30

XXVIII Peacemaking Workshop

With Rev. Dr. John Philip Newell speaking on "Peacemaking Among the Three Abrahamic Faiths." Sunday afternoon, 1:30-5:30 p.m. at the First United Methodist Church, 50th & St. Paul Streets in Lincoln.

April 12

Lincoln Earth Day Celebration

April 19

Omaha Earth Day Celebration

April 25

Arbor Day

*NFP State Office Hours in Lincoln, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. weekdays
941 'O' Street, #1026, Lincoln, NE 68508*



Speaking Our Peace

Once again, the Crimea has become the locus of peacemaking.

In the 1850s, a young Russian officer named Leo Tolstoy was so appalled by what he and his troops did and saw in the Crimean War that he wrote *Sevastopol Sketches*, the first modern fiction debunking war's glory. (http://archive.org/stream/cossackssevastop00tols/cossackssevastop00tols_djvu.tx) After this came his *War and Peace*, pacifist novels and tracts, and his students Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the later Nelson Mandela.

Now we revisit Crimea with talk of 'Putin's war' and the need for 'strong action' against him with (in the poet W.H. Auden's words) all "the windiest militant trash important people shout."

The Washington fairy tale would have us believe that the good Ukrainian democrats, ruled by the bad pro-Russian Ukrainian tyrant, freed themselves in a popular uprising, whereupon the really, really bad Russian tyrant made war, and only the decency of the West kept everything from destruction. But, they say, we might still have to fight for democracy and truth and pluralism.

The fairy tale, however, does

not square with the facts. Those so-called 'democratic' Ukrainian forces—especially those affiliated with the party "Svoboda"—marched against President Yanukovich with swastikas on their flags and armbands (<http://www.ibtimes.com/euromaidan-dark-shadows-far-right-ukraine-protests-1556654>). And they attacked Jews. *Haaretz*, the liberal Jerusalem newspaper has documented extensively the neo-Nazism and anti-Semitism of the movement (<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish-world/jewish-world-features/premium-1.576905>). A report in the UK's *Guardian* newspaper noted that most of the protesters in Kiev are not interested in democracy at all. "You'd never know from most of the reporting that far-right nationalists and fascists have been at the heart of the protests and attacks on government buildings," *Guardian* reporter Seumas Milne observed.

When the protestors acquired power, they voted to forbid all languages save Ukrainian, banned Russian media, and moved toward banning minority political parties. Torchlight neo-Nazi parades glorifying Holocaust collaborators have been commonplace of late ([http://defendinghistory.com/category/neo-nazi-and-](http://defendinghistory.com/category/neo-nazi-and)

pro-fascist-marches). The government has appointed four neo-Nazis as cabinet ministers, including most alarmingly the Minister of Defense. Putin rightly calls fascists these descendants of ancestors who welcomed the Nazis in 1941 and who received a Ukrainian "Reichskommissariat" from Hitler. They fully collaborated in anti-Semitic purges and genocide.

The Ukraine is an unstable, nonce country. The medieval Kievan Empire, founded around 1000 A.D., first came under the Polish/Lithuanian Empire, then the Ottoman, and then the Russian until the 1850s Crimean War, when the Brits, French and Turks came in again—ostensibly under the guise of protecting the rights of Western pilgrims to visit the holy places in Jerusalem, but in fact to reduce Russian power and prevent Russia from having a warm-water port at Sevastopol. After the Bolshevik Revolution, the Ukrainians collaborated with the West and the White Russians to attempt to throw out the Bolsheviks. They lost and, for their pains, experienced the mass killings of their rich farmers, the Kulaks—perhaps millions of them—in the 1930s. As they became a Soviet Socialist Republic, Stalin gave them Odessa from modern Moldova and Khrush-

chev gave them Crimea and Sevastopol from Russia, illustrating the fluidity of Ukraine's borders. The Crimea was not, until recently, even a part of the Ukraine.

When the Soviet Union broke up, the Ukraine did not enter the Russian Federation, but became a member of the Commonwealth of Independent states, tied loosely to Russia by trade, work and immigration arrangements.

Crimea went with Ukraine then, but the assumption was that Russia would furnish fossil fuel to the Ukraine and Crimea, that Crimea would provide Russia with Sevastopol as an accessible warm-water port, and that the continental Ukraine would provide the near-desert Crimean Peninsula and Sevastopol with fresh water and electricity. Ukraine voluntarily and intelligently turned over its nuclear weapons to Russia in compliance with the START treaty, and, in return, Russia, Europe, and the U.S. guaranteed Ukraine's borders.

A good deal? But the deal, even without the Ukrainian uprising, does not reckon with U.S., European Union and NATO expansionism or with Russia's

conclusion on page 11