



Climate Change Discussion Paper

Introduction 3

Kyoto II 4

Oasis Forestry Reform 7

FISCIL 10

New Technology 12

ANSR 13

Conclusion 20

Introduction

What have we done to try and address Climate Change up to this point in time? What I'm proposing in this new approach is roughly the opposite of what we've always done, and those with all the money and power in this world are going to want to see this happen even more than greenies.

There are five major elements to it, and what you're getting in this document is the unambiguous specifics of how we're going to do it, and most importantly, how we're going to pay for it:

There is a new international Climate Change agreement with the working title Kyoto II that China, India, Russia, and the United States will be first to ratify this time. It speaks the language of commerce, and although it does require them to do a lot, what it requires them to do are things that they've always done willingly. The sole purpose of Kyoto II is to get the whole world thinking in the same direction on Climate Change.

There is a complete solution for deforestation called Oasis that is also a long term plan for the global Forest Industries. It is a commercial solution for deforestation underwritten by legislation and international agreements that doesn't cost us a cent, and it establishes a carbon sink the size of Mexico. There is a lot that can't be said about Oasis at this point and I hope my explanation for this in that section is adequate. In addition to the complexity you get in that section, there is a simple run down as well.

There is a complete solution for overfishing called FISCIL that is also a comprehensive stewardship plan for the entire global saltwater fishery. It will add over a half a trillion dollars to the Global Fishing Industry for those in the Fishing Industry. It's a complete solution for overfishing that again, doesn't cost us a cent. A healthier and fuller ocean equals a better carbon sink.

There is a brief stopover on new zero emission technology, but little can be said about this side of it at this stage except that there are multiple options and I touch on two of them in that section.

The main workhorse in this approach to Climate Change is something that is designed to get the Fossil

Fuels Industry onside in taking their industry down to ten percent of what it is today; less. Fossil Fuels Corporations are not going to give up their fossil fuels business unless there is more money and more power to be gained by doing so. The Advanced Natural Selection Reform or ANSR will provide the Fossil Fuels Industry with replacement commerce in a two dollars for every one dollar they lose arrangement as we move away from fossil fuels. This is not a small number when you add it all up, and you are getting the specific details of where this money comes from in this document; it does NOT come out of government budgets. Fossil Fuels Corporations are going to be 100% and genuinely behind making fossil fuels redundant, because they get more money and more power if they are.

Why haven't we been able to solve Climate Change up to this point? When you get to the end of this document ask yourself if we're still going to have those problems now.

Kyoto II

If we are to be honest with ourselves, which we must be if we are to move forward on big picture issues, it is impossible to avoid the bleeding obvious that if you structure a statement of general principles and facts that says nobody has to do anything to address Climate Change and call it a Climate Change agreement, then obviously everybody is going to sign that agreement. I said earlier that we need to get everybody thinking in the same direction with our Climate Change agreement, but if that thought is, "we can sign this agreement and then not do a damn thing about it on the ground" then that's not really a very productive "thinking in the same direction" now is it? We can argue about it until the cows come home but none can argue that this is the bottom line in the COP21 agreement. Countries can choose to do nothing and fake it through those initial GS discussions in 2018 (with only a little embarrassment), and if they do nothing or "nothing", the larger embarrassment doesn't come around until 2023. Forget about whether this is a criticism because it IS a reasonable political

assessment of the language in the agreement. We need something better.

Kyoto II is a design for a new international Climate Change agreement that speaks the language of both developing and developed economies. The arguments of “we shouldn’t have to do it unless they do” from developed countries, and “it’s not our mess so why should we pay for it” from developing countries are arguments that will no longer be made. The new Kyoto Protocol speaks the language of commerce and switches the focus from something that governments don’t want to do (like emissions targets in the original Kyoto), to something that they want to do and do all the time; and this time America and Russia and India and China will be the first in line to sign it and then ratify it. Yes, even Americans if Republicans are still in charge of both Houses (and have a President); and if you follow American politics you’d know that sounds almost impossible (fossil fuels corporations will be pushing for this even harder than greenies; you learn why later on in this document).

Governments spend money on lots of things, but one of the few things they love to spend money on is actions that will increase commerce, and that is the focus of the new Kyoto Protocol.

That focus is the creation of Manhattan-style projects to develop new zero emission technology AND balancing reforms. Countries will be deemed to be in compliance with the new Kyoto by diverting x percent of their annual budget towards such projects. In order for you to understand how this qualifies as “actions that will increase commerce” (more than just the commercialisation of new technology), you need to connect the dots from here, through the New Technology section, and into the ANSR section. I’ll tell you what balancing reforms are and connect the dots for you at the end of that section.

Emissions targets are still part of the picture and are noticeable inside this picture, but they are no longer the focus of compliance. Compliance is now judged by funding for Manhattan-style projects. We add in afforestation initiatives (that can be big and flashy, very cheap, community projects that show action is being taken) and a few other things that

countries can choose to do for extra prestige or bragging rights, or just because they are actions that will improve quality of life for the citizenry; some of them will do it for that reason.

Before the COP21 agreement that everybody signed, Climate Change agreements were viewed in the vein of, “you must do this or else 50 years down the track, blah, blah, blah, maybe this, maybe that”. In practice, this is how the majority have viewed them, whether they want to admit it or not. The only thing COP21 changed in this regard was that it removed the “must” impetus in favour of, “do it if you want to do it”. Kyoto II moves the focus of Climate Change agreements away from all of that and into the realm of, “this is a competition and the biggest prizes in history are up for grabs”. Which of these is more likely to get action from its human participants? Which of these runs with human nature? And which of these takes no account of human nature? Yes apathy and sloth can also be part of human nature (the “do it if you want to do it” of the COP21), but when fossil fuels corporations will be pushing for such an agreement even harder than greenies (using all of the lobbying power they can muster all over the world), do you suppose sloth and apathy will win the day in this picture? Especially when politicians can use Kyoto II to undertake “grand enterprises that set a good example” (that even current Climate Change deniers will want them to do).

Kyoto II is going to be viewed very favourably by those who need to view it favourably in order for it to be adopted, but Kyoto II is not meant to be a solution to Climate Change. Its only purpose in this agenda is to get the world thinking in the same direction by focussing in on the things that those with all the money and power want to focus on. This is how we get the whole world focused on solving Climate Change. You have to run with the grain not against it. That’s Kyoto II.

May I suggest we fast-track Kyoto II so that most countries around the world don’t have to go through the process of embarrassing themselves at the meeting that comes up in 2018 as part of that COP21 agreement. If H3 gets up and running in the first half of 2018 the White Paper can be out by the end of the year, and the

Global Stocktaking discussions in November 2018 can be replaced with the initial formal discussion to adopt Kyoto II, or whatever we want to call it.

A separate discussion paper has been made available for Kyoto II, and it includes a draft agreement in correct language.

Oasis Forestry Reform

In this section there are a few paragraphs that are somewhat opaque and I explain the reason for that just before we get to them. The separate discussion paper for the Oasis Forestry Reform gives you more satisfaction on Oasis than you get in here, but the point I make in the third and fourth paragraphs below is an unfortunate fact about Oasis.

The Oasis Forestry Reform will add over 200 million hectares of plantation forestry. There are two fully formed implementations and structures for Oasis and whatever the final implementation looks like, the two key points are, that it is a commercial operation, and that it is underwritten by international agreements and national legislation.

Oasis is the one in the Climate Change suite that has major facilitating elements that defy adequate explanation inside a small space or a simple conversation. A simple explanation for Oasis as a whole is possible, and I give it towards the end, but when we scratch just below the surface of that simple explanation we get to the obvious question of, “okay but how do we allow for the removal of forestry from the countries that currently do it and into new countries that currently don’t do it (without losing jobs, businesses, *etcetera*)”, and this is where the opacity comes into it. You still don’t get the more opaque details in the Oasis discussion paper that is currently available, but you will be less concerned with their absence after you get through the conclusion in that discussion paper.

Oasis introduces too many new government and industry ideas and processes that we’re not used to seeing. They are things we can absolutely do, and those in charge will want to do them, but they are too difficult to parse inside a small space or a simple

conversation. Firstly because they are in areas of society that almost nobody ever delves into because it's too boring; things like international trade, government budgetary processes, semi-government corporations, regulatory systems and privatisation. And secondly because everything we use from these realms are all adapted to serve the Oasis Reform; with the exception of one of these being seconded almost directly out of government budgetary processes, the rest of what we take from these areas end up as Picasso versions of what we're seconding into service.

There is an atypical international trade organisation for example, that will be a massive economic entity that is designed to facilitate eccentric or atypical trading that will also be used as a stabilisation tool for the global economy. It is something that is part of Oasis, but it will also be part of another H3 agenda reform. For its use inside Oasis, Brazil and Indonesia and The Congo will stop cutting down their native forests (yes I'm well aware of the specific and very different dynamics in each of those locations), and they don't lose a cent in the process; the local corporations don't lose a cent, the local workers don't lose a cent, and governments don't lose a cent either, and mostly through this trade organisation.

To extend forward into the complexity a little, this trade organisation will operate as (part time) slave to another huge economic entity that will be created out of the regulatory framework of a certain group of countries (a huge entity but much smaller than the trade organisation). This economic entity created out of regulatory entities will be a newly created multinational corporation that both regulates the industry, with a lighter hand than what they're used to, and participates in it at the top; part of this will be the establishment of a massive common market for all forest products; a common market that is a hell of a lot closer to a single market, but with price eccentricities that will address the primary balance of trade issue mentioned above; the relocation of primary forestry operations into new countries.

This then leads back into the need for the international trade organisation because we need an

atypical trade vehicle through which to trade products because it's a peculiar type of common market for a "narrow range" of products rather than everything, and there's far more to be gained in this part of the picture than just the "free" trade of goods. Part of the trade organisation's function will be to adjust the price of goods being traded from country to country, constantly booking surpluses and deficits, because every country is not at parity, but everything is traded through the single market at single worldwide prices even though not everybody pays the same price, and in the bigger picture outside of Oasis it does this for more than just forest products; that's when it really gets complicated.

Just to digress for a minute, the multinational corporation that I just mentioned starts its life as a number of government entities that then merge together to form a single "multinational semi-government" entity that is funded either through the markets in two or three stages, funded to the tune of over \$100 billion, or through one of several other avenues which are touched on in the Oasis discussion paper.

That multinational is then privatised but in a very different way, and the governments who are relinquishing direct control of this multinational don't get any of the direct privatising return for this; they get other benefits: prestige for solving a problem, greater involvement in the international trade organisation, better international relations and some with countries they've had little to do with previously, and of course the thing they will value more highly than all of this; the tools to help them stabilise their economy if it is ever needed via the trade organisation mentioned in this part of the picture.

This all sounds very complicated and it is, but it's not complicated inside the framework of a White Paper, and it's not complicated inside the framework of establishing a massive global economic reform. When you have the space to stretch it out into a detailed explanation, and when people have become accustomed to the new language of the new type of solutions I'm putting forward, it really isn't as complicated as it sounds inside a brief stopover.

Fortunately, even though these details are a bridge too far at the moment, a superficial description is always possible for everything:

We create a massive multinational to create about 200 million hectares of plantation forest. We vest this corporation with special powers, operating under an international trust deed, that will allow them to form a common market for forest products. None of the existing corporations will be worse off under the new environment and they will have more freedom of movement than they are used to under the existing regulatory regimes. Employment is increased in the industry, the market for certain forest products gets bigger, and everybody with any power in the industry gets richer as a consequence of adopting the reform. However ownership of the new multinational is organised, all the new capital wealth created out of Oasis, which will be considerable, will be vested with all those who currently have ownership in the industry. As the plantation forests come on line, some of them inside five years and some of them in less than fifteen (yes five years and yes fifteen; I know), it is the existing corporations who harvest them and take the lion's share of the profit.

The last thing to say about Oasis in here is that it will create over 200 million hectares of plantation forestry in a few locations throughout the world, and the carbon footprint to create it will be miniscule. We're talking about a new carbon sink the size of Mexico.

As mentioned earlier, a separate discussion paper has been made available for the Oasis Forestry reform.

FISCIL

The FISCIL reform is a long term stewardship plan for the Global Fishing Industry that not only makes everybody in the industry richer, it also solves the issue of overfishing completely. Healthier oceans with more life will allow the oceans to continue to fulfil their role as the primary carbon sink on the planet. They would not remain so if we continued to hammer them as we have over the last two or three decades.

The FISCIL reform of the Global Fishing Industry

will add about a half a trillion dollars into the industry as it solves overfishing completely. This is how FISCIL works:

FISCIL segments the global seawater fishery into five regions. It creates five exclusive licences to fish those regions. These licences are then granted to five newly created multinational corporations that are owned by all the existing commercial fishing operations; from the multiple Cannery Ship fishing operations, to the five or ten people in a coastal fishing village in Africa who go out and fish to feed their village. These new multinational corporations then leverage the value of these licences in order to fund infrastructure and manufacturing projects that will clean up and restore the oceans back to what they were centuries ago, with a global stewardship plan that is a true stewardship plan by any estimation.

The most effective way to make money inside FISCIL is for these corporations to increase the volume of fish in their region of the oceans, and you can't do that very well unless you clean it up at the same time. Of course the positive twist is that the majority of the action required to clean the oceans is the very action that will increase the volume of fish in the oceans, and fish populations will be an audited baseline asset valuing statistic of these corporations. So we get a direct link between improving environmental conditions and making hundreds of billions of dollars. Cleaning up the oceans and repopulating them is the best and easiest way for them to make money, and of course that also happens to be what is required from an environmental point of view. Perverse isn't it; making hundreds of billions of dollars just for doing the right thing.

We increase employment in the industry, all those with any power in the industry get more money or more prestige and usually both, and we return the effectiveness of the oceans as a carbon sink back to what they were centuries ago, rather than progressively destroying them as we have for decades. That's FISCIL

There are a few documents on the H3 web about FISCIL. You should read them. They are the very obvious and straight forward proof of concept for this

new type of solution; solutions that make money rather than cost money as we solve the problem completely; and money immediately, not later on.

Mainly because of its simplicity, it's almost certainly the H3 agenda reform we do first (unless we fast track Kyoto II like I suggested in that section). The White Paper for this one will be out about nine months after the H3 organisation commences operations. The FISCIL reform can be explained simply, as I just did, but it still requires volumes in a White Paper.

By the time we get the White Paper out there, FISCIL will already be on the global agenda. Not maybe. It unambiguously and obviously solves overfishing completely, and it throws a half a trillion dollars at us as it does. We don't throw money at our problems inside the H3 agenda; the solved problem throws money at us; AT THE BEGINNING. We're not going to be dawdling with FISCIL.

Who knows; now that I'm actually talking about it and the FISCIL discussion paper is available for all to view, it may well be on the global agenda by the end of 2017. The FISCIL discussion paper explains it so simply that it is the proverbial two plus two. As in two plus two equals four but it also equals \$500 billion dollars.

New Technology

The fourth part of this complete solution to Climate Change is new zero emission technology that will cut emissions by more than 90% over the course of the next twenty years, and it can come from a few different sources.

Part of Kyoto II is Manhattan-style Projects for zero emission technology to replace coal, oil and natural gas. Several such projects working towards this end would produce acceptable options in less than ten years. For those who think we would need an additional push to create Manhattan-style Projects for this purpose, and we absolutely would, the fifth part of this approach to Climate Change called the Advanced Natural Selection Reform gives us that push.

So the Advanced Natural Selection Reform driving Kyoto II is one way to get the technology we need.

There are other options. Using the existing suite of renewables for energy generation is NOT one of them, but a more creative application for the existing suite of electric powered transportation can figure into the picture. There are options.

Yes, if you've already read the Water Tower document through to the end you will think this a very coy entry for new technology, but of course that is the way it must be played for the time being.

ANSR

You will probably need to consult an expert to confirm that we can indeed do what I'm about to say that we can do, but after you do and they do, this is the point at which you realize Climate Change is about to be solved, for real this time, AND on the fast track.

The Advanced Natural Selection Reform does most of the heavy lifting in the H3 approach to Climate Change, and there is no argument to be had about whether we can do it or not.

The ANSR will provide replacement commerce to the Fossil Fuels Industry in a two dollars for every one dollar they lose arrangement as we wean ourselves off fossil fuels. The faster we move away from fossil fuels as a fuel source, the quicker the share price of these Fossil Fuels Corporations rise. Most of them will no longer have their fossil fuels division after about ten years, but ANSR will see the Fossil Fuels Corporations grow to more than twice the size of what they are today.

Allow me to just emphasize that a little because it's somewhat important. A company like Exxon, currently worth about \$350 billion, and has been so for about a dozen years rollercoasting between 300 and 500, will be worth at least twice that and maybe even close to a trillion dollars about five years after we first start weaning ourselves off fossil fuels, and they will be deservedly viewed as one of the angels in ten years time (by environmentalists), rather than one of the devils (again, perverse isn't it). Do you think that all sounds like something they just might want to do?

And just to emphasize, it is new goods and services commerce they will be getting and not just, HERE,

have some free money to put in the bank. It will be new commerce with additional power and industry attached to it and not just free cash. To emphasize a little further, it's not that they get a slice of the replacement technology; split up into a hundred pieces that wouldn't be big enough; it's something much bigger, and they will have dozens of choices; almost two dozen that I've defined and others will come up with more.

Before we continue I should make a brief comment to the Fossil Fuels Industry about the big number mentioned below: Don't get too excited as it's not all for you; there are other uses for the ANSR resource. Your slice of it is as stated above.

So if the Fossil Fuels Industry, and all the politicians and world leaders that support it, will be 100% and genuinely behind shutting down most of the industry and moving to zero emission technology right across the board, which they will be if what I'm saying is the case (more money, more power; fame and acclaim for doing good), where do you suppose the fight against solving Climate Change is going to come from?

If you haven't heard about this before now and you haven't read *The Prince Principle* or *Save Steps* books, then you have only one question on your mind at the moment. Where the hell does all of this money come from????

The two original ways I had designed to get this money together were somewhat complicated, and as it turns out completely unnecessary. The final major lightning strike in the development of the ANSR was that we didn't need to go to those complicated options. We just needed to go to the simple. We just needed to use something that we'd already been using for decades.

All the economic powers in the world operate inside a system we call fiat currency. To be quippy about it, money exists because we say it exists. Monetizing debt for example is the main way we create currency out of nowhere. It's pure legerdemain, sleight of hand; it is artful trickery. Many would argue the point about monetizing debt, but it's not necessary to have that argument because we don't need to go down

that track.

In the period immediately following the Global Financial Crisis back in 2008, the US Federal Reserve pulled \$16 trillion dollars out of nowhere to prop up the banks. This \$16 trillion existed, because they said it existed.

If we can do it for that purpose, to replace, then we can use this same principle to create a whole raft of replacement commerce and take ourselves off fossil fuels. And after all, everybody, EVERYBODY, in positions of power will be overwhelmingly keen to do this, so it's not as if I'm suggesting something we'll need to force down their throat.

Yes I know I've made it sound like the \$16 trillion was all put out at once when it wasn't, but I use that number because that is the number under which it can be found on news websites (real ones like Forbes), and whether the number is \$16 trillion or something just over \$1 trillion, creating that much money out of vapour and then returning it to vapour is the key point here. Also, the picture in this area is far too murky for us to make a complete assessment of it, so the best you can do is to investigate it yourself and make of it what you can. Without deep dives into how the banks played around with their assets when they had a hold of that Federal Reserve money, we can never get the complete picture. That we create enormous amounts of money out of nowhere when it suits us (in a dozen different ways when we're being creative) is the material point.

So how are we going to get this money together for the Advanced Natural Selection Reform? We create a \$30 trillion financial resource from which to draw funds for very limited purposes. As was said earlier, there are three different ways to do this inside our current system without causing any negative financial ripples; only positive ones. Two of them are more involved and require even further qualification, but one of them can be related quite simply now that I've given you the qualification I've just given you: We get together either a minilateral or multilateral group of countries, so in other words the G8 members plus China, India and Brazil (hopefully Russia won't be on the outer for too long and it will again be the G8), or a full session of the United Nations, and we just agree to

create this massive financial resource by fiat (who knows, this may be the thing that brings Russia back into the fold).

If we create the resource in this way we'll almost certainly go down the minilateral track, because outside of the top twenty or thirty, any country saying no will just be causing mischief in accord with the standard geo-political rules. Some of them wouldn't really get it that the normal rules don't apply in this situation.

Doing this under our current economic system in a free for all usage policy may or may not cause extra difficulties (read about the buffer in long term holding positions overviewed in Appendix V of The Prince Principle). Current economic theory suggests that it would cause more difficulties than it solves if this resource were used under a "use it for anything policy", so we don't do that. We only use this resource for replacement commerce, or under a few other usage rules that will also have only positive impacts on the global economy.

We will fudge the lines on this one; of course we will. We meaning politicians, and fudge the lines meaning that our usage rules will be ignored for a few small things here and there, of course they will be, but there is about to be a massive amount of new commerce introduced into this world, and there will be no negative economic impacts from fudging the lines a little.

Make no mistake. Now that this is out in the open with the general idea of how we're going to do it, and with a White Paper to lay it all out in detail emerging inside the next two years, this is going to be our reality sometime in the next five years. With specific usage rules to ensure only positive effect on global and local economies, those in charge of the world today are going to turn their noses up at having another twenty or thirty trillion dollars to play with? I hardly think so. This WILL be our reality sometime inside the next five years.

So we create a massive financial resource from which to draw funds. These funds will then be used to develop and establish new goods and services commerce (held inside a new international territory

created to house this new commerce in its formation, and the ANSR resource itself, if necessary). This commerce will then be delivered to the Fossil Fuels Corporations as replacement commerce for that which they're giving up: There are well over a dozen different types of commerce that will be part of this reform; hard assets, goods and services commerce, and as I indicated earlier, what I've managed to come up with won't be the only options. I've provided a large but incomplete list as part of Appendix V in The Prince Principle. There are twenty different types of commerce put forward in that Appendix, and in those twenty alone we have significantly more than what is required to replace fossil fuels commerce in the way we do it in this reform.

An important part of ANSR is that it absolutely needs to be replacement commerce and not just money for nothing and your chicks for free. Free money to be squirreled away into a bank (or mutual fund or any other long term holdings) would create additional problems, in the implementation and further down the track. Money to be squirreled away into a bank is a bad option. And after all, it's not as if the new commerce options are drab and few in number; and they're going to be the best investment options with the most upside heading into the future anyway so.....

There is something for the Advanced Natural Selection Reform that I wasn't going to mention because it seems far too abrasively passive aggressive, and because it is something that people would have a knee-jerk reaction to. After a rethink it occurred to me that with the number of shareholder's rights groups out there, there is no way it could have been kept off the radar; not a chance in a billion. It actually serves the senior corporates more by it being mentioned in this way in here, rather than if it was discovered and blown up as if it was some big secret agenda by senior corporate types to "steal money from, whoever". Then of course there is the bonus for me in that I get to indulge in one of my favourite hobbies; giving the rich Right wing arseholes a serve. I don't do it endlessly in my books but I do it more than once; and just so that I'm not misunderstood on this point, the capital R

Right wing is the point here, so in other words I don't think all rich people are terrible.

This last little meandering wander into the dark corners of the ANSR is for those who may be wondering about how quickly we could move away from fossil fuels. People have always thought that such a thing would take forever even if we had an easy and obvious alternative. Let's have a peek behind this door shall we:

All of the senior corporate executives and boards of directors of all, ALL the top thirty, forty, fifty oil companies in the world will look at this through their lens when the ANSR White Paper comes out. When it is confirmed by all and sundry that we can indeed do this, and every single aspect of it is correct, they're all going to issue themselves two year, three year, four year stock options (or an equivalent money grab in jurisdictions where they don't allow such things). This is not a maybe; it is a nature of the beast thing. Anybody out there still think this would happen slowly.

Issuing stock options to themselves in such a circumstance sounds corrupt; it sounds shonky, and of course it is. But it is business as usual and it is legal, so just let them have it. It's one of the main reasons we get this thing implemented in two years (after the White Paper) rather than five.

The bottom line for the shareholder's rights orgs: If you let them have their stock options you get the massive benefit from this reform in two years rather than five, and it will only shave a tiny percentage of the return for other investors anyway (which is more than made up for by getting it three years earlier), so just let them have it. If you happen to be in a position in the future where you can make an issue of it; Don't! It's pretend money out of the share market ether and they're not taking any noticeable amount from anyone, so just let them have it.

The inherent nature of the ANSR is such that the global agreements that need to be in place in order for us to do it would happen far more quickly than any international agreements that have come before, so we get our fast track already. When we add in this wrinkle this is how it happens at light speed, and everybody

who has access to the brakes will be pushing the accelerator instead. On the fast track it can happen five years after the White Paper comes out and compromise after compromise will draw it down to something far less than its best form. At light speed it will happen in two years and it will happen in very close to its pristine form. No matter how it is done the very rich are going to get their extras, so just let them have it in this way (with their stock options) and be done with it. Doing this in its pristine form is better for everyone, even the very rich, but they're not smart enough to get around themselves in their silly zero sum oriented negotiate for cents now rather than take dollars later attitudes (in the realm of the PPD and NPD, they know what they know and they want what they want and they want it now; and if you try to stop them it's fights and enemies until they get what they perceive as an additional five percent, even though they were always going to get 100% later on and were told as much at the beginning; they can't see straight and they are absolutely convinced that they see straighter than anyone else). We need to be the grownups in this picture and just let them have it. I want to give the rich and powerful nasties everything they want inside the H3 agenda, but they will never be under any illusions that I will be doing it for them.

And to the rich Right wing types out there who may be angry at me for revealing this aspect of it rather than keeping it to myself: Try to engage brain and realise that however this turns out with it being given full sunlight like this, it would have been far worse if it was kept under cover and then discovered by some shareholder's rights org; and that it would have been discovered, by about a thousand different people, is absolutely certain. With the revelation of it inside this "protracted contumely", you stand a far better chance of keeping hold of these bonuses than if it were kept a big secret.

Finally for the Advanced Natural Selection Reform, let's connect the dots on why, in a fossil fuels-mad world, countries will be genuinely keen to spend billions on research for zero emission technology and balancing reforms: Firstly, balancing reforms are what I've just been telling you about. They are solutions to a

major problem with social, political and economic elements that are designed to completely mitigate all the negative impacts of solving that major problem, whatever the problem is we're trying to solve. The Manhattan-style projects are going to be keenly undertaken by all major countries, because fossil fuels corporations will be pushing harder for these than they have ever pushed for anything in their one hundred and sixty year history (and they've pushed pretty hard on lots of things, and almost always gotten their way). Fossil fuels corporations don't get the massive benefits that flow from the ANSR unless we have the technology to replace fossil fuels. So the development of new technology inside Manhattan-style projects doesn't only create the new commerce that comes from commercialising the new technology, it also activates the ANSR reform and its trillions of dollars of new commerce.

Yes, if you've already read the Technology sections in Eden is Burning or the commercialisation section of the Water Tower document you can see a contradiction in here, but until we actually do what is mentioned in those two sources we have to assume we don't have those in the bank already. And in any case there is always the second generation, third generation and fourth generation of solutions and technologies to be had, so we need to proceed down this path anyway. With the masses of ANSR commerce to come, expenditure on Manhattan-style projects are a drop in the bucket so why argue about them? Let's just do Kyoto II and be done with it because plenty of good will come out of it even if we don't need it to get the technology required to activate ANSR. Again, we must assume that we do need it for that purpose at this point.

So that concludes our journey into the Advanced Natural Selection Reform. Wasn't all of that fun? And it's something we can do as well, so how about that???

Conclusion

Just for a moment let us abandon the main underlying premise of this document and assume that Climate Change isn't even real.

Through Oasis we reorganise the global Forest Industries in such a way so as to add a few hundred billion dollars into the industry and over a trillion dollars in new assets as well; all commercially viable operations.

Through FISCIL we reorganise the Global Fishing Industry in such a way so as to add a half a trillion dollars into the industry, we clean up the oceans because it's the best way for us to make even more money inside a reorganised Industry, and we return the volume of fish in our oceans back to what it was centuries ago.

Through the ANSR we get rid of the primary causes of air pollution and send the current major players in the Fossil Fuels Industry down a path (that they want to go down) where they are making twice as much money as they did before by cleaning everything up, but by proxy in mostly non-cleanup industries rather than as janitors (direct cleanup is something they may not be overly keen on). There are direct cleanup options and if none of them go for those then others will take that commerce up, and the status and prestige that goes along with it.

With ANSR driving the development of new technology, with or without Kyoto II, we get our zero emission technology in quick order because the Fossil Fuels Industry will still be in a rush to make fossil fuels redundant so they can get all of that new commerce; money, money, money.

So if Climate Change is real then we solve Climate Change completely (and deforestation and overfishing as well) and add over \$20 trillion to the size of the global economy as we do.

If Climate Change is not real then we make ourselves over \$20 trillion.

The bottom line on this new approach to Climate Change is that this is all worth doing whether Climate Change is real or not.

Adopting this approach will make us trillions of dollars. The fact that it just so happens to solve Climate Change at the same time (and deforestation and overfishing as well) is a bonus. Think of it as a way to make over \$20 trillion. Forget about Climate Change (and deforestation and overfishing) and just focus on

the money. At this early stage of exposure to this new type of solution motivations are irrelevant. Just do it for the money.

Now to all of you greenies out there, and all of those with resources who have wanted to solve this problem for a very long time, I'm obviously not directing the words in this Conclusion towards you.

And lastly, don't forget to ask yourself that question from the Introduction.

Sean Gallacher

0424 529 885

61 424 529 885

abc@h3hq.org

www.h3hq.org