

Every month since February 1987 the Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation has produced one-hour TV programs on issues related to peace, social justice, economics, the environment, and nonviolence.

The Olympia FOR's program airs several times every week (currently every Monday at 1:30 pm, every Wednesday at 5:00 pm, and every Thursday at 9:00 pm) for the entire month on Thurston Community Television (TCTV), channel 22 for Thurston County's cable TV subscribers. You can see TCTV's current schedule at [www.tctv.net](http://www.tctv.net).

You can also watch the program described below (and more than 160 of our previous monthly interview programs and also many special programs) at the Olympia FOR's website, [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org). Simply click the "TV programs" link, scroll down, and click the program you want to watch. Many of our website's TV program listings also include links to documents summarizing the program in Word and/or .pdf format.

## October 2017

### "Better Strategies about Democracy, Fossil Fuels, etc."

- Please invite more people to watch this interview and/or read the thorough summary (which you're reading now) at the "TV Programs" part of [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org).
- See sources of information near the end of this document.
- This summary includes a few points that we could have said during the interview if we had more time.

by Glen Anderson, this TV series' producer and host

The Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation's October 2017 interview explores how we can strengthen the grassroots movements for two issues we care about: (1) protecting our communities, environment and climate from fossil fuels; and (2) reforming several aspects of our electoral systems in order to strengthen democracy.

Two expert guests share some recent and current progress and plan for the work we must do next. Together, we explore how to devise smart strategies so we can more effectively inform and engage the public so we can move ahead. Both of our guests are Senior Research Associates for the Sightline Institute, a very smart non-profit organization based in Seattle:

- Tarika Powell graduated from Vanderbilt University Law School and has an additional Master's degree. She also brings her expertise in environmental law to her work at the Sightline Institute, where she researches and analyzes energy policy and infrastructure.
- Margaret Morales earned her Master's degree from the University of British Columbia's Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability. She also has additional education and experience in the environment, and she serves on Sightline's Democracy Research Team.

### Sightline Institute conducts smart research and devises smart strategies for effective outreach and messaging

Glen said that for several years he has been reading materials that our guests' organization – the Sightline Institute – has been producing. He has found Sightline's information to be well informed, strategically smart, and very practical. He especially appreciates what Anna Fahey, Sightline's Director of Strategic Communication, has written to help people devise smart strategies with effective messaging.

Margaret summarized Anna Fahey's approach to strategizing and messaging so the information can get past people's biases and assumptions. Margaret said that Anna works with the researchers in each of Sightline's priority issues to do this. While factual information is important, we communicate most effectively when we are grounded in people's values. Glen agreed and mentioned that Anna had recently e-mailed a short video urging people to use "Values Sandwiches" when communicating. Start by affirming some values that the audience holds. Insert the substantive information. Then close by reaffirming the values that support that information.

Tarika affirmed the usefulness of Anna's approach for helping many kinds of issues for many constituencies. Sightline is a "think tank" but can't merely throw a lot of facts at people, so Sightline is savvy about how to communicate information to people, including people who are not already engaged in the issue. Focusing on people's values can help us communicate our information effectively.

## The Pacific NW is a "Thin Green Line" that we want to be a barrier to fossil fuel export

Glen said he was impressed by Tarika's expert research and writing about fossil fuels in our Pacific NW region. She has been saying that here in Washington, Oregon and British Columbia are a "Thin Green Line" – a barrier preventing the export of fossil fuels through here to Asian ports. Tarika said Sightline Institute created the concept of the "Thin Green Line" to express what the people in the Pacific Northwest have been doing to stop the onslaught of proposals from the fossil fuel industry for moving fossil fuels (coal, oil and fracked gas) into our region for export. She said we need to prevent the fossil fuel industry from "giving the Pacific Northwest a Gulf Coast makeover."

This is strategically important for protecting the climate because if we can prevent their export, we can help to keep those fossil fuels in the ground.

Glen expressed appreciation for Tarika's point that national borders are artificial and for Sightline's comprehensive approach to working with British Columbia as well as Washington and Oregon. Our land and our waters are all interconnected. Likewise, Canada's First Nations people and the US's Native Americans have worked together with the regional climate movements across the artificial national borders. Tarika said pollution crosses these artificial national borders, so our organizing must cooperate across borders too.

First Nations and Native Americans were here long before the white settlers colonized the region, so they are well grounded and committed. "Frontline communities" (Quinault, Lummi, poor neighborhoods, etc.) are especially vulnerable too. The Puyallup tribe is fighting Tacoma's LNG plant.

On September 26, 2017, the Sightline Institute published an article titled, "Failure for Final Coal Export Project." The subtitle celebrates this great accomplishment: "The Northwest's Thin Green Line defeats every coal scheme." Read the article at [www.tinyurl.com/ybr4jtqr](http://www.tinyurl.com/ybr4jtqr) The original link is [http://www.sightline.org/2017/09/26/failure-for-final-coal-export-project/?utm\\_source=Sightline%20Institute&utm\\_medium=web-email&utm\\_campaign=Sightline%20News%20Selections](http://www.sightline.org/2017/09/26/failure-for-final-coal-export-project/?utm_source=Sightline%20Institute&utm_medium=web-email&utm_campaign=Sightline%20News%20Selections)

## Sightline Institute focuses on several fossil fuel projects

The Sightline Institute has been focusing on a number of proposed fossil fuel projects in our region. One is the methanol plant proposed for the Columbia River. Tarika said Northwest Innovation Works is a corporate arm of the Chinese government. They are trying to build very huge ("gargantuan," she said) methanol plants in the Northwest. The one proposed for Tacoma would have been the largest methanol plant in the world.

Methanol is "wood alcohol," a petrochemical derived from fossil fuels, such as fracked gas. We defeated the huge proposal for Tacoma but two proposals on the Columbia River remained. They would use extremely large amounts of water in the process of producing methanol. They would produce toxic chemicals in addition to the toxic and highly flammable methanol. The plant proposed for Kalama (on the Columbia River in SW Washington) is farther along than the other one. Ordinary people there are saying this is the wrong way to create jobs. Jobs are not the only thing people want. We also want clean water, safe communities, public health free from cancer, etc. Sightline and other non-profit organizations provide the information that the fossil fuel companies don't want to discuss, so people can make informed decisions.

## Tacoma's Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) proposal

People in Thurston County and ten other counties in Washington State get our electricity and natural gas from a giant corporation, Puget Sound Energy (PSE), which is owned by a much larger conglomerate company based in Australia. PSE wants to build a big facility in Tacoma to do several things with liquefied natural gas (LNG).

Tarika said there have been several proposals for LNG export facilities in the Northwest. But PSE's Tacoma facility would process LNG in several ways, not export it. Each of these different processes with LNG would create new safety

hazards. She said PSE's "safety analysis was very inadequate." The environmental assessment failed to address a number of safety hazards and would endanger the public. It violates many safety recommendations that responsible industry bodies have established for LNG facilities.

Also she said Tacoma's city government – the lead agency – did not adequately notify the public or seek adequate community input. This sneaked through the city's approval without the public's awareness or participation. Besides ignoring ordinary people, the city also missed the opportunity – and the need – to get expert information and insights.

Glen said in some communities the fire chief objects to a proposal as being beyond what the local fire department can handle, or medical experts object because a proposal would cause serious health problems. This is important feedback. Tarika said we need many kinds of inputs into these kinds of proposals in order to make them safer. But this was lacking in the Tacoma LNG proposal.

Tarika disputed the natural gas industry's propaganda that natural gas is "clean." She said this was an early example of what is known as "greenwashing" – propaganda that makes something that is bad for the environment sound OK on the grounds that it is better than something else. While natural gas might be less bad than coal, most natural gas now is derived from fracking, so it is terrible for the environment and climate. Now about 90% of the natural gas wells in the US are fracked.

Tacoma's LNG proposal – and many other hazardous facilities – raise the issue of "environmental justice." Tarika said "environmental justice" is about paying attention to "frontline communities," the communities most hurt by environmental ills. So, for example, the communities along rail lines would be most affected by coal dust blowing off from coal trains' open hoppers. Indigenous communities are very often "frontline communities." The Tacoma LNG proposal would especially hurt the Puyallup Tribe. It would be built next to a superfund site and next to the Puyallups' reservation. If the toxic soils were dredged up and if the toxins were released into the waterway, the Puyallup Tribe's environment would be seriously hurt, but the grossly inadequate environmental assessment neglected to investigate that.

When oil spills have occurred in Washington State, often the first people to go to the sites were tribal communities. Tribal communities often have been the first impacted and the heaviest impacted from oil spills.

## **We have won several victories against fossil fuels**

Glen said that people who care about local communities, public health, the environment and the climate often feel overwhelmed by the huge number of fossil fuel export proposals that we must fight – and we can feel overwhelmed by the huge power of giant corporations. But we need to recognize also that we have won some victories – and build upon these successes.

He said that when the Lummi Tribe brought its totem pole through Seattle in 2016, Tarika spoke at a public event about our victories stopping fossil fuel facilities in WA, OR and BC. During our interview she highlighted that people in our BC-WA-OR Cascadia region's "Thin Green Line" have stopped about 10 coal export terminals, 6 or 7 oil-by-rail projects, and several pipelines. She quoted someone from the oil industry who said, "Everyone knows that the Pacific Northwest is where fossil fuel projects go to die."

## **Devise smart strategies for outreach and shaping our messages about fossil fuels**

Glen said that in order to win more victories, we need to devise smart strategies that will help us reach out to the public, inform people, bring more people into the movement, and help us convince the media and the government to stop the bad stuff and do good things instead. He asked Tarika how we could devise smart strategies for outreach and shaping our messages about fossil fuels.

Tarika said we have a long tradition in our region of good grassroots organizing. Stopping these fossil fuel projects requires strategies and actions at federal, state and local levels, because any project requires approvals at all of those levels. Especially now when the federal government is in disarray we need to focus our strategies and efforts especially at local levels where we can influence the decisions. Glen also affirmed tribal powers which – although they work locally – are independent nations too. Tarika affirmed the usefulness of building partnerships with tribes, because they have long-standing knowledge of the region and its issues.

## Seattle's Democracy Vouchers

The next part of the interview invited Margaret to share her information, insights and recommendations for how to make progress toward a more robust and authentic democracy. We need to solve the problems that have been interfering with real democracy so we can create a more robust democracy and better alternatives to the status quo.

Margaret and Sightline's Democracy Research Team have been working on an innovative reform in Seattle that is now being implemented. In November 2015 Seattle passed a "Democracy Voucher" program. This is a smart alternative to big money's dominance in election campaigns. It is being used now for the first time in 2017.

Margaret explained that Seattle's Democracy Vouchers are a smart way for the public to fund city-wide elections. Public funding itself is not new. She said 32 jurisdictions in the U.S. use some kinds of public funding for elections. Seattle is the first to use this particular method. Every registered voter in the City of Seattle can use them. Some other legal residents can donate to this fund too. Each registered voter gets to donate \$100 of public money to a candidate for city-wide elected office who has agreed to participate in this program. To be eligible to receive these Democracy Voucher donations, a candidate must agree to certain things, including spending limits, caps on how much other money they can take from people, and transparency in some funding-related matters.

This motivates candidates to talk with more people – and more diverse people – among Seattle's population, rather than spend so much time courting big-money donors. They need to talk with real voters in order to earn the voucher donations.

Margaret said this is exciting for several reasons. One is that a person can run for office with a viable campaign even if they do not know a lot of rich people. She said the program has been "enormously successful" and "surpassed anyone's expectations." By the time we videotaped this interview in mid-September 2017, a huge number of Seattle's people had already given through this voucher program – far more than have donated in previous city-wide elections.

## Initiative I-1464 would have helped a lot if it had passed in November 2016

Glen expressed disappointment that Washington State's voters failed to pass Initiative 1464 in the November 2016 election, although it fell only slightly short of a majority vote. Margaret is a member of the Sightline Institute's Democracy Research Team. She summarized what Initiative 1464 would have done.

I-1464 would have strengthened democracy by reforming several aspects of campaign finance at the statewide level. For example, it would have created something similar to Seattle's Democracy Vouchers for persons running for the state legislature. Margaret said that this was such a new concept that it needs a lot of communication with people in order to get the public to understand and support it. She said the public overwhelmingly knows that our election campaign financing has very serious problems. But she said people feel so helpless that they have difficulty understanding that they can indeed solve the problems and supporting specific solutions.

The Sightline Institute ([www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org)) published Margaret's June 16, 2016, article, which explained what I-1464 would do. It would have:

1. Blocked Big Money's influence
2. Lifted the curtain on Big Money
3. Enforced campaign laws
4. Amplified the voices of everyday Washingtonians

Margaret said there was not much organized or wealthy opposition to I-1464, but Glen said that his reading showed that some people who had "axes to grind" expressed opposition. Margaret said I-1464's new activities would have been funded by charging sales tax to people who live outside of Washington State but buy things here. She said some retail businesses here were afraid this would hurt their sales so they opposed I-1464. She said that when knowledgeable people analyzed these numbers they found that that argument was not valid. There really was not other organized opposition. Glen said that the opposition propaganda that he read was making "straw man" arguments rather than discuss I-1464 honestly and accurately on its merits.

Glen asked whether the people who organized I-1464 thinking about trying something similar again, but Margaret said she was not aware of anything yet.

## Instant runoff voting

The interview moved on to other ways to strengthen democracy. We talked about how to change the actual voting. Margaret said our current way of voting actually dilutes the voices of many voters outside of the mainstream majority or plurality group. She said the “plurality group” is the group with the largest number of people, even if they are not an actual majority. For example, she said that 40% of the voters can prevail if the other 60% of voters are split into smaller different pieces.

Glen mentioned that one alternative – which the Olympia FOR’s TV series has discussed before in some previous programs in years past – is Instant Runoff Voting (IRV), which is also called Ranked-Choice Voting. When several candidates are running in a primary election for one position (for example, a state’s Governor), people might be afraid to vote for who they really want because that person is not likely to win, so they don’t want to “throw away” their vote and instead vote for someone not as good in order to prevent an extremely bad candidate from winning. A remedy for this is Instant Runoff Voting (IRV), which is also called Ranked-Choice Voting.

Margaret pointed out that IRV cannot produce proportional results, and proportional results would be a better remedy. But IRV does fix the problem of “vote-splitting” and what has been called “the spoiler effect” or “the Nader effect,” a label attached after the 2000 presidential election. IRV empowers voters to rank their preferences for which candidate they most want, which candidate they want somewhat less, and on down, ending with the candidate that they think is worst. If your first choice is not elected, your vote is reallocated to your second choice. This process proceeds in turn until we end up with a candidate who has a majority of votes. Your voice still counts, because even if your first choice did not win, you still affect the decision that is eventually reached. Margaret said that with IRV, “you don’t need to worry about throwing your vote away.”

## Proportional representation

Even better than Instant Runoff Voting is Proportional Representation. Margaret is enthusiastic about Proportional Representation for multi-seat elections, such as city councils. She explained what Proportional Representation is and how it would work. She said the basic principle is that “any legislative body should proportionally represent its constituents.” So, for example, she said if 40% of the people support one thing, 30% support something else, and another 30% support something else, the legislative body should reflect those 40-30-30 proportions.

Instead, we have many people who consider themselves “independent” rather than members of any political party, but in partisan races, very few real “independents” are ever elected. Glen added that people who belong to smaller political parties (Greens, Libertarians, Socialists, etc.) are prevented from electing their candidates to legislative bodies, even if each of these parties has 10% of the voters. Margaret agreed that legislative bodies should reflect the proportions of different kinds of voters.

Glen mentioned that Yakima, Washington, has a huge Latino population but never elected any Latinos to their city council until a lawsuit changed their voting system, and now they have many Latinas serving on the city council. Margaret said that Yakima solved its problem by another method instead of proportional representation. She and Glen said they changed from “at-large” to district voting, and this allowed parts of the city with large Latino populations to elect people to represent them. Glen expressed appreciation for Bre Weider from with the Washington Voting Justice Coalition, who was a guest on Olympia FOR’s July 2017 TV interview, because she and her non-profit organization had worked on the Yakima case. (That program is watchable through the “TV Programs” part of [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org)) Margaret pointed out that voting by districts – although it improved diversity in Yakima’s case – is susceptible to gerrymandering, the process by which people with political power redraw district lines to reduce diversity in legislative bodies.

Proportional representation is a better remedy, she said. If districts were big enough, we could have multiple positions within each district, so we could elect several legislators at one time. These could be proportionally represented. Margaret said Washington State law allows, for example, a nine-member city council to be elected with one member from each of nine districts – OR – to put all candidates into one election and choose the nine who got the most votes. We could devise a method for proportional representation.

## **Solving other electoral problems**

When Glen phoned Margaret to prepare for this interview, she said, “The U.S. is still stuck in 19th Century democracy. We are playing catch-up to many other democracies in the world.” Glen mentioned that the U.S. has lower voter turnout and less precise representation than other nations. Many other nations have a wide range of parties represented in their legislative bodies. Margaret agreed and said that most democracies use some form of proportional representation.

She suggested changing the Washington State law that currently requires single-winner races. Cities could urge the state legislature to change this law so the cities will be able to change their local ways of running elections to improve democracy.

Glen mentioned gerrymandering – drawing district lines in manipulative ways to benefit a particular political party or other power group. Washington State uses an honest, neutral way to do this, but some Republican-dominated states seriously violate people’s voting rights by drawing district lines in horribly partisan ways. Some are so extreme that courts have overruled them. Margaret said we should not be overconfident about Washington State’s process, because some parts of the population are underrepresented.

Other nations allow all citizens to vote, but in the U.S. states impose obstacles to voting. You have to register. Some states require hard-to-get ID cards and impose other obstacles. These seem designed to suppress voting rights, especially among people who might vote for a party other than the one that dominates the state government. Margaret suggested removing barriers. Automatic voter registration would help.

## **Creative approaches for more robust, profound democracy**

Glen said that in some other nations, cities vigorously welcome and involve ordinary people in making substantive decisions, such as city-level budgets.

There are more opportunities than we had time to discuss during this interview.

## **Devise smart strategies for outreach and shaping our messages about democracy**

Just now, Margaret had suggested several ways to strengthen our democracy. We can achieve these reforms only if ordinary people get informed, get organized, and push effectively to accomplish these reforms. Twenty minutes before, Glen had asked Tarika how we could we devise smart strategies for outreach and shaping our messages about fossil fuels. Now he asked Margaret how we could we devise smart strategies for outreach and shaping our messages to strengthen our democracy.

Margaret’s recommendations were similar to those Tarika had proposed. We need to ground ourselves in our values and speak from our values. When we support stronger democracy, we should affirm that every person deserves to be heard, every person deserves to be represented, all votes should be equal, and people with more money should not have louder voices than the rest of us. These messages resonate with people. Affirm these. Then we can talk about solutions.

## **Deeper insights and more powerful strategies about fossil fuels**

Beyond the substantive conversations we’ve had just now with each guest’s respective areas of expertise, Glen invited both guests to share deeper insights and more powerful strategies.

Tarika emphasized the importance of working at the local level. We are doing this in the Pacific Northwest and nationwide. We have won many victories in stopping fossil fuel export terminals and other fossil fuel projects. Now let’s figure out how to get beyond being merely reactive and actually become more proactive. She said the Sightline Institute and local people are becoming more involved in local land use planning. People really can get active locally where we have power to protect our communities. Glen agreed and said that many local communities have stopped bad proposals by saying, “Our local land use planning policies would not allow this project.” Tarika agreed that local governments have stopped projects. She urged more local governments to put more limits and restrictions in order to protect local communities. Do this proactively before a bad project is proposed for your community. The City of Portland, Oregon, imposed sweeping restrictions on fossil fuel projects and spared itself from serious problems. A great many people in Tacoma

have risen up and said strongly that they feel the Port of Tacoma and the city government are not representing them well and they demand rejection of bad fossil fuel projects currently proposed. Vigorous land use planning can prevent Tacoma and other communities from becoming magnets for giant fossil fuel projects.

Glen agreed and said that land use decisions are commonly made away from transparent public view, most people feel these matters are boring, so they do not pay attention. But big business and the real estate interests do pay attention and later ordinary people “discover some horrible thing in your neighborhood.” Tarika said it has been encouraging to see more and more people – ordinary people and families – coming out and participating in local democratic processes.

## Deeper insights and more powerful strategies for democracy

Margaret also offered additional insights and strategies to significantly strengthen our movements regarding democracy. She said that she and Sightline would like to pursue the kind of “deliberative democracy” that Glen had mentioned a few minutes earlier (*e.g.*, ordinary people making city budget decisions and improving their city bus system, as in Porto Alegre, Brazil). Margaret agreed and urged ways for ordinary people to become vitally engaged in city-level decisions instead of passive consumers of the end result decided by elites.

## Interconnections among fossil fuels and democracy – and perhaps other issues

Strategically savvy people recognize interconnections among various kinds of issues – including, for example, the topics we are discussing during this interview: fossil fuels and democracy. Interconnections among issues help us understand more profoundly how issues affect each other and how issues affect different kinds of people. If we understand these interconnections, we can bring more kinds of people into working together to solve society’s problems.

Margaret said that the Sightline Institute is a think tank about sustainability issues. They started with issues related to the environment, but then they recognized that the public policies that would be good for the environment were “not getting through,” so they recognized that our democracy is broken. This led Sightline to create its program for strengthening democracy and to devise better insights into how to create effective messaging.

Tarika said that Sightline works on sustainability and recognizes that sustainability has several layers. In order for our environment and society to be sustainable, our democracy must become sustainable, we need housing for everyone, and we need ways for all people to add their voices to public policy discussions.

Glen agreed and said democracy is much more than merely voting. We must stay informed and engaged all year around not only at election times.

## Information about the Sightline Institute

Glen said that several times during this TV interview he has expressed appreciation for the Sightline Institute, the Seattle-based non-profit organization based in Seattle for which both of our guests work. Their website is [www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org). It’s a regional organization focusing on Oregon, Washington and British Columbia.

Margaret said they work on several sustainability-related issues, including fossil fuels, climate, democracy, and housing. Tarika said Sightline is very well respected for its work. She said much information is posted at their website, [www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org). She said the information about natural gas has been very useful in helping organizations come out strongly against natural gas. “There’s nothing natural about it.” We need to reduce its use in order to move ahead for sustainable energy methods.

Glen expressed appreciation for the many materials he has read at their website, including articles written by Tarika and by Margaret. Sightline’s materials are not only informative but also are well written. Some organizations’ materials are tedious and hard to read and understand, but Sightline’s are very easy to read and understand, while still solidly informative. Tarika said that Sightline believes everyone has a role, so they want their materials to be accessible to everyone.

## Sources of information and follow-up action

Glen said people need good sources of information, so he mentioned just a few during the TV interview, and we are listing more below on this page.

Sightline Institute

[www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org)

1402 Third Ave, Suite 500

Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: 206-447-1880

Toll Free: 888-447-1880

Regarding both fossil fuels and democracy, many great non-profit organizations exist in our Pacific Northwest region and nationwide. Some provide information, encourage pushing on different parts of the government, create opportunities for nonviolent direct action, and other useful strategies.

Some good sources of information are posted on the “Climate Crisis” part of [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org)

For information about strengthening democracy, Glen encourages people to watch the Olympia FOR’s July 2017 interview and read the document he wrote summarizing what our guests said. The end of that thorough summary is a list of many excellent non-profit organizations working to strengthen democracy. To watch that interview and read the document and resource list, visit [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org), click the “TV Programs” link, and scroll down to July 2017. To watch the program click the program title. To read the thorough summary, which ends with an extensive list of information resources, click the Word document link next to the program title.

A great statewide organization – Fix Democracy First – works to reform elections in Washington State. Contact them at (206) 890-0489, [www.fixdemocracyfirst.org](http://www.fixdemocracyfirst.org)

## Closing encouragement

During this hour we have explored how we can strengthen the grassroots movements for two issues we care about:

- (1) protecting our communities, environment and climate from fossil fuels; and
- (2) reforming several aspects of our electoral systems in order to strengthen democracy.

We shared some recent and current progress and some proposals for the work we should do next. And we explored how to devise smart strategies so we can more effectively inform and engage the public to make more progress.

Each of us can find one or more ways to inform ourselves and work to solve the problems.

Nowadays people are confronted with many serious issues. This TV interview series has been examining these issues – and helping people work on them – for more than 30 years since 1987.

We have addressed the climate crisis and democracy in many of our previous programs that are still timely today. You can watch previous interviews on these topics by visiting the “TV Programs” part of [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org)

You can get information about a wide variety of issues related to peace, social justice and nonviolence by contacting the Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation at (360) 491-9093 or [www.olympiafor.org](http://www.olympiafor.org)

We're all one human family,  
and we all share one planet.  
We can create a better world,  
but we all have to work at it.  
The world needs you! You can help!