

Subject: Climate Emergency Action Plan

Date: February 26, 2021

Concerned People,

In a recent Elgin E-mail thread "Hydrogen and Nuclear", my friend Jeff kept repeating this idea that he doesn't believe that there is a realistic plan out there to address global warming.

I would like to spend some time to address this statement, because I disagree, and I think this is causing great confusion in the decision-making process.

Jeff said on Wednesday, February 24, 2021 at 5:11 PM:

There exists NO plan to switch the current 80-5% fossil fuel sources to any form of renewable. So, I argue that there's no time to waste to get the FBR online ASAP as there's nothing that indicates that anything else of scale will be done!

I responded on Thursday, February 25, 2021 at 4:21 PM:

There IS a plan, my plan. There is also the [Regenerative Economy](#) plan that I told you about in the last E-mail....

That makes **at least 2 plans**. There are at least 2 plans that I know about. That is not "NO plan". Again, here is my plan to refresh your memory:

[the direct mailer plan](#) I am trying to get started would begin to have a public discussion, like the one we are having now, so that we can come to a better understanding of the urgency of the issue and what we must all do, and have more broad support for [a more overarching plan](#), but this will never occur until more people in the public are aware of [the true urgency](#) of this crisis and [what even one person could do within a short period of even 100 hours](#) if there was enough broad support and consensus and the younger generations such as those of [Greta Thunberg](#) have been crying out to us that we need to fix this and that we can fix this.

Jeff replied on Friday, February 26, 2021 at 9:39 AM:

OK, as I argued in another email here's why I continue to say that you don't have a plan. You have a number of things that you find necessary to do but no process to accomplish them in a realistic fashion. For example, whether anyone likes it or not, we are heavily reliant on fossil fuels (see <https://ourworldindata.org/energy-mix>) and your statement:

"Immediate indefinite moratorium on all new fossil fuel projects except enough to preserve a tiny fraction (0.1% or some number that does not infringe on a goal of 350 PPM CO2 in atmosphere as soon as possible, as determined by scientists with a proven humanitarian bias) of existing usage."

doesn't provide a path to accomplish it. Yes, we MUST eliminate our use of fossil fuels, but there must be a process to do that, presented in a coherent manner.

Here is my reply:

The indefinite moratorium on all fossil fuel projects is a necessary step because we are simply already out of carbon budget as explained in the [Sky's Limit Report from 2016](#), which calls for a “managed decline in fossil fuel production” and the same thing is said here in this report from 2016; it says “Key Recommendations: No new fossil fuel extraction or transportation infrastructure should be built, and governments should grant no new permits for them.”

You said “**You have a number of things that you find necessary to do but no process to accomplish them in a realistic fashion**”. However, the problem is in your own brain, not me. Your brain is telling you “what is realistic” based on the current socially and culturally acceptable framework of thinking. But this itself needs to change. It needs to change, as I have already said, but, as I said, **this will never occur until more people in the public are aware of [the true urgency](#) of this crisis**. In order to fix that, I have proposed [the direct mailer plan](#) I am trying to get started would begin to have a public discussion. And as I said, **if there was enough broad support and consensus and the younger generations such as those of [Greta Thunberg](#) have been crying out to us that we need to fix this and that we can fix this**.

What I am saying is to **stop trying to solve this problem in little tiny circles of exclusive people**. This is a problem that affects everybody and should be brought to the attention of everybody.

You, and the leaders around you, keep trying to keep people in the dark about the issues and sell the people short **telling us that these people “will never give up their warm showers and cold beers”** (in the words of Sean Casten, a congressman, at a recent public town hall, trying to defend fossil fuel projects) and so you don’t even try to bring this problem to the people. But as I told Sean, **I bet that most people would give up warm showers and cold beers if they understood that it meant that this would be required to save the future for their children**. When I spoke this to Sean at the public meeting, the whole room was clapping, indicating that regular people actually do agree with me on this.

What I am trying to say is that my plan starts with public inclusion and a real direct mailer plan, not the phony direct mailer plan that was adopted by the Elgin Sustainability Commission without adopting the exact measures that Sunflower and I discussed and without heeding our rather lengthy arguments and discussions about why we needed (1) a whole sheet of paper, not just a “150 words or less blurb”, with Draft #7 clearly explaining (a) the urgency, (b) the hope because we have solutions readily available, and (c) a full, two-way public forum where everyone can discuss this (which mainly got stopped because we could not get anyone in the city of Elgin government and activist circles to agree to pay, or try to lobby for, around \$15,000 - \$20,000 to mail to 41,000 addresses in Elgin, but nobody in Elgin Sustainability Commission or Elgin City Council thought it worth fighting for although I fought hard to make it happen, even though the Elgin City Council regularly hands out \$500,000 contracts without any public discussion at all). **As of yet, the urgency has clearly not**

been expressed or felt by the people of Elgin. (2) a real public forum was agreed would be needed and a simple Facebook page is just a placeholder and not a real solution, as chairman Tom Armstrong agreed, but still all we have is just a Facebook page, which is actually a Facebook page for something else and nothing on this page about the Climate Emergency. I offered to build this whole forum web page myself for free but was flat out denied from even participating in any part of the web page or even the landing page construction process or even any of the wording (3) the landing page is woefully inadequate and does not explain the urgency, which Tom and the Elgin Sustainability Commission has systematically denied and refused to address, (4) there is no connection from the Elgin city web site to the landing page.

...doesn't provide a path to accomplish it.

The path starts with the Direct Mailer and the public forums, which I think I've explained now at least 50 times. Until we can get people on the same page, people will simply flop back into their old, unsustainable ways. What the Elgin Sustainability Commission did with my Direct Mailer idea is a joke and does not do the idea justice. I quit the Elgin Climate Emergency Workgroup because nobody could listen or understand or agree on not one single thing I was trying to do, or even convey the information I was giving in that Workgroup to the Commission or the Council, which is why I've been instead just resorting to E-mails. Instead, they were insistent on doing things their own way, which, as we've seen, has been completely inadequate of getting the job done.

Yes, we **MUST** eliminate our use of fossil fuels, but there must be a process to do that, presented in a coherent manner

I am sorry that my style of doing things is not what you are used to. My mind is more of a creative mind and not one of your carefully ordered coherent types.

If you think it should be expressed differently, perhaps you should take it on yourself to express it.

I tried to explain it very carefully on my web site at the links I gave above. Did you read through all of those links? I am sorry that I feel that you seem to be asking for me to spoon-feed this information to you. To me, this seems simply a stall tactic or method to simply deflect me and postpone confrontation with this information, which is a popular tactic among public-facing politicians these days.

A long journey always begins with the first step. You can't really decide which cab to take for a cab ride that you may take a month from now, if you don't even know what town you might be in a month from now.

As they teach in Alcoholics Anonymous, the first step with dealing with addiction is recognizing that you have a problem. Until Americans can recognize that their addiction to fossil fuels, then there is no chance in dealing with this addiction to fossil fuels.

From my point of view, the solution IS completely to have Americans start to confront and understand the problem in a truthful manner. There really can be no other first step.

Jeff also wrote on Friday, February 26, 2021 at 9:39 AM, in his first analysis of specifics:

You also state:

"All car companies must immediately stop producing gas-powered vehicles and must only make electric vehicles (similar to the WWII effort where all car companies immediately stopped making cars and just made tanks)."

But how? Under what authorization would this be considered? Wouldn't congress need to create some sort of legal structure to allow the US government to make such a mandate?

A presidential executive order could accomplish this overnight. Donald Trump proved this.

They did this during World War II, so it is not a stretch to see that they could do this now.

[In February 1942, it took no more than 3 years for GM to transition from 100% cars to 100% tanks.](#) If we put a moratorium on factories in Detroit making gas cars tomorrow, they still could sell the millions of cars sitting on car dealership lots.

And then there's:

"Immediate indefinite moratorium on the flight of all gas-powered aircraft, except in the case of military self-defense, and in that case, only permissible if flying over one's own country or within a few miles of the border (self-defense)."

Again, under what authority?

Answered above.

What is the consequences of destroying an entire mode of travel with no alternative?

This would have to be done in conjunction with the #9 part of my action plan.

If you read further down on that same page under #1 it also answers this question:

"People need to stop trying to have such a fast-paced, break-neck economy and expecting immediate access to all parts of the world. That is why we have such things as telephones. For those who need to travel long distances, they should expect that travel time might be a factor, as it was a hundred years ago. "

There doesn't need to be alternative. People need to learn how to make do with less.

See also above what I said in response to what Sean Casten said.

People will be willing to make due with less if they understand why this is important.

Do you see how this plan works now?

It has to be carefully tied into the American people's willful acceptance of these measures, which starts with the Direct Mailer and similar type campaigns.

It does seem that people at the top of our society do not understand how deeply misinformed and confused the majority of the public really is with regards to the climate emergency issue, and don't realize how insidious the deluge of misinformation and propaganda has an effect on the American people.

I propose supporting the development of hydrogen as an alternative fuel source, so that could provide the means of transition.

This would be a good R&D effort, but it will take some time. Currently, 95% of hydrogen energy is currently being generated by natural gas, which is a fossil fuel (see <https://www.popularmechanics.com/science/energy/a926/4199381/>).

Getting Americans on the same page to make do with less is the alternative we have for the present time frame. We realistically have to move ASAP; we cannot sit around waiting for more R&D.

Perhaps it's that we see "plans" differently. I see more a process that suggests how to accomplish it and you just saying what needs to be done.

The process starts with an honest direct mailer on city letterhead and an honest public inclusion campaign, as I keep saying, and have tried to explain this E-mail.

Is this getting through? I will keep trying to repeat my process and explain it until we have some type of understanding.

It is not abstract; the process is called "public inclusion". This is part of what the Eagle and Condor prophecy said was necessary for our modern time.

I think that if you were to rework this as a process you'd see a clearer path, such as considering banning wouldn't be necessary if the following were done, starting with your C:

1. End all fossil fuel subsidies

Yes, this is part of my action plan at #1.C, but I think this, by itself, is not enough, and also will probably never happen without more pressure from watchdog groups.

2. Calculate all current externalities associate with fossil fuel use and add that as a tax to their cost. This will provide an economic pressure to transition to nonGHG emitting energy sources.

I disagree with this approach, although I see that you have the support of many others in the community.

My understanding starts with [this Indigenous Environmental Network paper on the dangers of monetizing externalities, and the fallacies of taxes, fees, carbon trading, etc.](#)

As a real-world example, consider what is going on in British Columbia. They instituted a carbon tax in 2008 but [it did not actually affect GHG emissions from 2008 - 2014](#) and GHG emissions actually went up since they instituted the carbon tax.

3. Another step in the process

I would suggest that we stop waiting for “another step” when you have what is clearly “the first step”. Have you ever been to an AA meeting? Addiction is a very daunting, seemingly impossible problem to overcome. We must clear our minds of the fear of the unknown and begin with the first step, which is that We (the American people) have to acknowledge that We (the American people) have an addiction to fossil fuels and that this is a problem that will take all of us (the American people and allies) to overcome, but first we have to acknowledge and recognize and truly confront this problem as a whole people, which will require The First Step to be taken by our local governments, who control to the minutest detail what a majority of people think, do, and act upon.

In the words of Greta Thunberg:

The bigger your platform - the bigger your responsibility.

Adults keep saying: 'We owe it to the young people to give them hope'.

But I don't want your hope.

I don't want you to be hopeful.

I want you to panic.

I want you to feel the fear I feel every day.

And then I want you to act.

I want you to act as you would in a crisis.

I want you to act as if our house is on fire.

Because it is.

from ["Our House is on Fire"](#)

Paul