



Climate Change Discussion Paper

Preamble 3

Introduction 4

Kyoto II 5

Oasis Forestry Reform 8

FISCIL 11

New Technology 13

ANSR 14

A bit of “silliness” 21

Conclusion 23

Addendum 26

FISCIL is the most straightforward and ANSR is the flashiest, so if your time is limited then that's where you start.

Preamble

We cannot solve any of our biggest problems unless we have the enthusiastic participation of those with 99% of the power in this world (or is it only 98% or 95%). It is the politicians and the corporations who have this power. In global scale actions **they get to decide whether we do a thing or not**, so if you are not making them happy then all you're going to get is a fight and/or empty promises, such as what we've had over the last fifty years of the environmental debate (forget about what they deserve or we'll never fix anything). This approach is roughly the opposite of what you're used to; not merely addressing or mitigating, actually solving the problem by making money rather than the problem costing money to fix (not a single penny and we create massive economic surpluses right at the beginning). Shouldn't this be the gold standard for what we've been trying to accomplish for the last fifty years; a genuine solution that those in power will want to do even more than greenies. Just because this solution gives those with 99% of the power in the issue what amounts to everything they want doesn't mean I'm actually on their side. I'm firmly entrenched on the side of what's good for the majority; I'm on the side of fixing the problem and this WILL do that. There are no holes in these discussion papers and these reforms will all work "as advertised" (*Green, liberté, égalité, fraternité*), but they are discussion papers, NOT White Papers. There are no holes in these reforms; just ask.

Introduction

Keep in mind as you read through that we're talking about actually solving major global problems, so the scale, the size of the actions, is going to be much bigger than what you're used to seeing or thinking about.

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 complete solution for overfishing called FISCIL that is also a comprehensive stewardship plan for the entire global saltwater fishery. It will add hundreds of billions of dollars into 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. FISCIL is the most straightforward of all the H3 reforms, and is therefore the easiest to understand. FISCIL is the best place for you to start.

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 some 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 Global Stocktaking

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.

Oasis Forestry Reform

The Oasis Forestry Reform will add over 200 million hectares of plantation forestry. It solves deforestation, establishes a long term stewardship operation for the Global Forest Industries, and contributes as part of the solution to Climate Change.

If we want to make something like this happen so that it will actually be done, we need to do it so that those who hold all of the power in the industry, politicians and corporations, will desperately want to do it. And if they desperately want to do it, then it's a safe bet that it will be done. These are the main points:

- Commercial re-organisation of the Global Forest Industries inside a single massive multinational.
- This includes capitalisation of the entire Global Forest Industries; some of it already is but nowhere near all of it.
- The industry is formally monopolised under the Oasis umbrella through international agreements and national legislation in all relevant jurisdictions.
- This multinational can be seeded through the markets but it is far more likely to be seeded using the ANSR resource. It'll be worth a lot more to the owners if it is. You'll find the details of ANSR in that upcoming section.
- The current owners in the industry own the Oasis Corporation in direct proportion to their current economic interest in the industry.
- The current owners will need to navigate a few changes in how they operate but they remain as independent entities, and the biggest change for them will be that they'll be planting a hell of a lot more than they're cutting down in the areas they currently operate. They DO NOT become business units of a larger corporate entity.
- Creation of 200 million hectares of new plantation forest in a few different places around the planet is established to solidify their control of the industry and create a massive asset base.
- The Oasis Corporation develops and manages these plantations and controls the global market for forest products.
- We wean ourselves off native deforestation over the

first twenty years of Oasis operations; in practice about year ten to year twenty, with no doubt some small amount of use after that if it is ever needed.

- We're able to do this before the better trees in the Oasis plantations start to come on line because there are already a significant number of plantations currently in place and managed by the existing players in the industry. We'll essentially be "using them up" with increasing frequency in that ten to twenty year time period and beyond.
- Significant moves will be made to change developed world attitudes to certain wood products, and new technology will be introduced to facilitate greater use of what would be viewed today as lower grade wood product (younger trees, chips).
- One of the key elements in Oasis is removing forestry from countries that currently do it, and establishing the "entirety" of the Global Forest Industries in two or three areas where we've never done it. How this is accomplished so that countries who currently do it actually want to do it is one of the most involved parts of the H3 agenda of reforms, and it's not going to be addressed in here. It's covered as well as it can be at this early stage inside the Balance of Trade section of the Oasis discussion paper. If you go to that document, make sure you read the second last paragraph of the Conclusion. It's the most important thing you need to know about Oasis at this point.
- Obviously all of this is codified inside a public trust document and controlled by international agreements and national legislation that greatly limits the range of action the larger entity is permitted to take. And because they are a monopoly and therefore have no need for secrecy, every document and action is open to the public; like a FOIA system in the most open government in the world.
- Everything mentioned in here so far has been about timber or wood products commerce. Those who are familiar with global deforestation issues have been waiting and waiting for me to mention the elephants in the room and I'm going to do that now: Palm oil, farming, and charcoal and fuel wood

use are the three biggest problems that plague the three main tropical forest regions on this planet. The solving of these issues is tied into the Balance of Trade part of Oasis (mentioned in the Oasis discussion paper), but has even more to do with some of the commerce mentioned in the ANSR section coming up and another H3 agenda reform called CODIN, which is discussed in several H3 books.

- I could just spit out in plain language how we fix the palm oil, farming, soybeans, and charcoal and fuel wood part of deforestation, but until you are aware of the extent of the Oasis elements covered in the Balance of Trade Issues section in the Oasis discussion paper, and until you get a quasi-primer on CODIN by reading the twenty or so sections about CODIN in one of the H3 books called Save Steps (and then the CODIN discussion paper when it emerges), it wouldn't make much sense to you, and more importantly, you wouldn't be able to see how it's possible. The Balance of Trade Issues section in the Oasis discussion paper is about as clear as mud, and I address why it is that way at the beginning of that section.
- Allow me to give you some small amount of satisfaction on this part of the fix for deforestation. It would be possible to use part of the ANSR reform to move future expansion of palm oil, farming, and soybeans in Asia and South America to locations where deforestation was not required, but the Africa part of this equation is going to require CODIN to fix it. Think of ANSR as the eagles in the Lord of the Rings and Hobbit movies; it can *deus ex machina* almost anything if you ever need it to. ANSR is not used very often in the H3 agenda but it can be used to plug any hole that needs to be plugged. ANSR will not be used for this part of Oasis, but it could be.

So will those who hold all of the power in the industry be desperate to do this as I suggested at the top? By doing this the current players in the industry get to increase their power base both upwards and sideways. Because this is likely to be funded via ANSR they get a \$200 billion injection into the industry to undertake all

of these activities (ANSR is huge), which means the Oasis Corporation is worth a lot more to them (not having to dilute their interest by going to the markets). Those in the industry are currently portrayed and often tend to behave as though they are the bad guys and that will no longer be the case; I'm sure they're not going to hate that. There is a floor and a ceiling to the upside for those currently in the industry if they take this path, and from an economic point of view, a power point of view and a public perception point of view, the floor would not be any lower than double what they have today if this is funded through ANSR.

The separate discussion paper for Oasis mentioned above gives you more detail, and of course the ANSR section coming up will help you understand how what I've said above about ANSR is possible.

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 and repopulates the oceans. 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 hundreds of billions of 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 (not sold) 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 when this is done on a global scale, it cleans the oceans better than any other action we can take (other clean up will be necessary but this is the biggest part of it). Technology has already been developed to do this (all natural, no chemical catalysts), and others will emerge to give us options as people get their thinking caps on in this area. Fish populations will be an audited baseline asset valuing statistic of these (public) corporations, so we get a direct link between improving environmental conditions and making hundreds of billions of dollars (profits and market cap increases). Cleaning up the oceans by repopulating them is the best and easiest way for them to make money. Perverse isn't it; making hundreds of billions of dollars just for doing the right thing. The volume of macroscopic life in the oceans is a single digit percentage of what it was two hundred years ago, so there's a lot of room to push it back up from where we are today.

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

FISCIL is the very obvious and straightforward proof of concept for a new type of solution for the world; 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). 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 very early in 2019. 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 an option, but not in any of the ways we've imagined up to this point, and a more creative application for the existing suite of electric powered transportation can figure into the picture as well. There are more viable options that DON'T require a big breakthrough than most people realize, but they all require the enthusiastic participation of the fossil fuels industry and we definitely get that with the ANSR reform, which is up next.

Yes if you've already read the Water Tower document through to the end (in the discussion

papers) you will think this a very coy entry for new technology, but of course that is the way it must be 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 (and included that list in the back of this document as well). 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 were 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 aether 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; balancing reforms are solutions to major problems that

will never cost a cent to implement and will always make massive economic surpluses right from the start. 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???

A bit of "silliness"

..... for those who like numbers. This section has been named so purely because I believe estimates such as this have no real value at this early point, no matter how well researched they are. The nuanced dynamics of Climate Change are too far up in the air at the

moment to be making estimates like this (if we start to right the ship quickly the numbers are not going to be what we imagine they will be). But, I recognize that people do like this sort of thing, it is a common thing to do, and it can give an impression of the general direction this approach to Climate Change is going to take us. There is so much that I'm not allowing for in this "silliness" because the point is to illustrate general direction and not precise figures, which as I was just suggesting is not going to be possible.

As at sometime in 2018 the total amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere was estimated to be something around 3200 gigatonnes. This represents about 410ppm, which means 1ppm equals about 7.8 gigatonnes. In order for us to get back below 300ppm of CO₂ in the atmosphere we need to make a net gain of over 800 gigatonnes of CO₂. The way we make it up is by increasing carbon absorption (inside the H₃ approach all through natural processes only) and by decreasing emissions. I was going to continue on in this section in this vein and flesh it out, because even though I pooh-pooed it above I do like this sort of thing, but because the figures we'd end up with would probably be way out, how about this instead:

We're currently spewing about 40 gigatonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere every year, over 90% of this being from fossil fuels use. The annual ppm increase of CO₂ jumps about a bit, but to estimate on the higher side let us say we're getting a 2.5ppm increase of CO₂ annually at the moment (2.5 x 7.8 gigatonnes; 19.5). Roughly speaking what this means is that about half of the 40 gigatonnes is being sucked up by the land and the oceans, and the other half is accumulating in the atmosphere.

The H₃ approach to Climate Change is going to reduce total CO₂ emissions down to something far less than 10 gigatonnes per year within twenty years, and will increase carbon absorption in the oceans by an amount that is impossible to estimate at this point, but it should almost certainly be more than 5 gigatonnes, and could even be over 15 gigatonnes in some years. And what's more is that the way in which the CO₂ will be going into the oceans will be a lot healthier for the oceans than what's currently taking place; the pH

levels will come back up and normalize. We get this massive increase of CO₂ absorption by the oceans because the volume of macroscopic life in the oceans is less than 10% of what it was two hundred years ago, and the FISCIL reform of the Global Fishing Industry will push this back up to where it used to be. It's not only the size and frequency of catches one needs to take into account when determining how depleted the oceans have become, it's also the size of the individuals and the size of the mid-zone and ocean floor ecosystems.

There is a lot more to take into account than what I've put in here, including elements of the ANSR reform that will have a noticeable impact on this picture, but to cut a long story short, if we're cutting emissions by over 30 gigatonnes per year and increasing CO₂ absorption by over 10 gigatonnes per year, then we get back down below 300ppm a hell of a lot sooner than the end of the century. I did a calculation sometime in 2018 taking into account every relevant part of the H₃ agenda, and my rough estimate was that we'd be somewhere around 310ppm by 2060, but that may have been a bit optimistic. We'll see.

Now of course a very important thing for you to bear in mind here is that with the massive increase in fracking, and the acceleration of ice melts in the temperate and polar regions of this planet, the volume of methane seeping up into the atmosphere is somewhat larger than it has been in the past, so we will need to do better than we currently believe on our CO₂ calculations in order to allow for this. Of course it's a moot point because once we set something like this in motion, cutting emissions down to the bone and pushing the carbon absorption back up to where it's supposed to be, the planet finds its own balance, which is the whole point of this very large exercise in the first place.

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

Addendum

In the ANSR section I mention there are different classes of commerce we'll be creating from the ANSR resource; the replacement commerce that will be apportioned to fossil fuels corporations for the trillions of dollars of commerce they will be giving up as we wean ourselves off fossil fuels. These are the twenty options I've come up with; others will come up with more. This is essentially a straight lift from Appendix V of **The Prince Principle** book, and there is a lot more discussed in that book than just this approach to Climate Change, so there are a few explanatory notes required before you get into this Addendum properly:

The H₃ operation is about a completely different approach to the world's biggest problems that is based on a breakthrough in social theory called **The Prince Principle**, and over the course of almost twenty years I have applied this new approach to most of the world's biggest problems. The book called **Saving the World in 100 (not so easy) Steps**, which I usually shorthand as Save Steps, is the H₃ agenda of global reforms developed over almost twenty years broken down into bite-sized pieces. The acronyms CODIN and NECS mentioned below are two of the biggest reforms in the H₃ agenda. The other references below that you may not know are the GER which is another reform on the H₃ agenda and is also an H₃ division whose long form is Global Environmental Repair, ICE which is a standard reference for Internal Combustion Engine, and LDCs which is another standard reference for Less (Lesser, Least) Developed Countries.

I've broken down these classes of ANSR commerce into two different sections; those that are available if we only assume the five elements in the H₃ approach to Climate Change; and the second group are the other classes of commerce that come into play if we also assume other parts of the H₃ agenda:

1. Recycling: When we have a "subsidised" change-over from ICE cars to electric (or some other better option) recycling goes through the roof. Not subsidised in the true sense of the word but it's close, and it will have the same effect as if it were a

subsidy as we've come to understand the term.

2. Recycling: Accelerated retirement, dismantling and re-use of existing power plants.
3. Recycling or repurposing of fossil fuels transportation infrastructure (trains, ships, trucks etc).
4. Building new cities is a more complicated option than simply going out and “building Las Vegas in the middle of a desert”, and a few people around the world have learned this lesson the hard way over the last decade or two. There needs to be more than just spectacle to draw people in, and more than just industry and the promise of jobs (I believe there was one in Spain – was it Spain – and at least one in the Middle East that didn't even have those). We've never had non-debt seed capability for such a thing in the past, and when this is combined with the details of this commerce option in the ANSR White Paper when it arrives, it will be evident that we can build fifty successful cities the size of Columbus Ohio inside this commerce option. There is a book called [ttk ohtk tks mks](#) coming out in the first half of 2019 and I go into some city elements in one of the chapters called ONE HQ. This will no doubt be one of the more fun and popular options. Done properly this is easily \$20 trillion of new commerce all on its own; it can be over \$20 trillion even after taking account of commerce leeching and transfers from existing cities.
5. Accelerated schedule for construction of new power stations. The vast majority of this will be done under the umbrella of H3 and some significant portion of it will be contracted into several entities for use as ANSR commerce. This one is jumping ahead and assuming “facts in evidence” that are not commonly known to be so at the moment. I allude to this in one or two parts of this document, and in the Commercialisation section of the [Water Tower](#) document; and the complete context is in the first technology section in the [Eden is Burning](#) book.
6. The existing service station infrastructure (gas station, petrol station) stays and is transformed if

we move over to electric vehicles. This will avoid the need for replacing this part of our jobs infrastructure. If we move to other technology that does not require this infrastructure then we can put our thinking caps on about how to use all of this (mostly) prime location real estate in the creation of new businesses; not necessarily retail, not entertainment, not property development (although some will certainly be used for this); think of it in these terms and we'll come up with at least one brilliant option for city and town locations and at least one for highway locations.

7. Desalination is going to be increasingly needed in developed countries. With subsidised implementation through ANSR (if needed; it may not be) and the drive to increase agriculture to participate in the increasing global demand that will be driven by the H3 agenda, this becomes a more attractive proposition, especially when.....
8. We already have options for using the massive amount of sludge generated by desalination plants, and there will be new technology options to use even more of it in the near future. We need to return the lion's share of it back out into the oceans, but we're about to produce "Mount Everest" volumes of it; we can use some of it for high-tech heat capture and low grade construction, and we probably will. We could also use almost all of it as part of point 19 below, but again, we DO need to return the majority of it back from whence it came. Also, there will be discussions about whether we need to return all of it back into the oceans, and it's a high probability outcome that argument will win out. When done on this scale it's a little more complicated than just pumping it back out into the ocean in any old location; Climate Scientists consulting in conjunction with experts on oceanic currents and FISCIL corporations and we'll be just fine.
9. The closure, dismantling, and proper rehabilitation of fracking sites involves a little bit more than almost anybody realizes at the moment, not least of all because nobody has even thought we would be doing such a thing, ever, let alone within a few

years from now. This will be a much larger option if we move over to the NECS because we're able to do a lot more of it, as commerce, inside the NECS.

10. Conversion and use of some existing oil and natural gas industry infrastructure. The two obvious things that come immediately to mind will be to second the offshore oil and gas rigs into service for the fishing industry, and to start using oil and gas pipelines as water pipelines; this infrastructure is extensive so whether it be for water (used creatively or otherwise) or something else, we need to find a use for it.

A significant portion of the rest of this list is commerce created under the CODIN and/or NECS reforms, and we rope in some percentage of it for use as ANSR commerce. The NECS is a new system of economics and commerce that is introduced in the first five sections of the Save Steps book, and CODIN is the H3 approach to address globalisation that is introduced in entries fourteen to twenty-nine of the same book. One of the features of the Save Steps book is that I tell you how we pay for each initiative if we go to a new system of economics and commerce, AND how we pay for it if we stay inside our existing system. The reason for pointing this out being that we can still do most of the elements on the rest of this list whether we go to the NECS or not.

11. An increase in agriculture in most developed countries, but the truly gargantuan side of this new class of commerce, many trillions of dollars of it, comes in from LDCs through the NECS and CODIN reforms. This one is primarily about increasing the amount of land available for new agriculture.
12. Meat Production for developed countries will be increased and the demand for it will be increased as well. But again, over 95% of this class of commerce comes into it from LDCs for LDCs and will be driven by the NECS and CODIN reforms. This one is going to be very different from how all but about 0.1% of people were imagining, until they got to this sentence.
13. Residential construction will go through the roof in

every country in the world as a consequence of adopting the H3 agenda; it would mostly happen through the NECS and CODIN reforms.

14. Civil Infrastructure likewise, although what is designated as such is a little different in developed nations than it is in LDCs, and again it would be mostly inside the NECS and CODIN reforms.
15. Think of what we need to do in order to garrison a region against drought so that it can continue to produce peak agricultural output year in and year out, rain, hail or protracted shine. This is a class of commerce I refer to as Permanent Agricultural Infrastructure. We need to do a “little” of this in developed countries, but again, the lion’s share of this happens inside LDCs via NECS or CODIN or both.
16. The vast majority of afforestation undertaken as part of the H3 agenda happens inside Oasis for those in the Forest Industries, but there are other uses for new forests than just plantations. Some afforestation will happen inside NECS and CODIN as well.
17. Refilling Lake Chad and maintaining it at its historical highs can be viewed as part of the Permanent Agricultural Infrastructure, but it’s mainly part of the agenda to fix the global environment. The Aral Sea is another we need to refill in this part of the agenda, and the economic benefits from refilling the Aral Sea and then completely mitigating the affects of that massive salt pan blowing around the region for decades, will run into hundreds of billions of dollars annually. Fixing the global environment comes out of the GER, the NECS, CODIN, and ANSR. All of it needs to be done and it happens through these reforms whether we move over to the NECS or not.
18. If we move over into the NECS then part of the activity we undertake as part of that system is environmental cleanup of all the things “we” have always resisted cleaning up; ALL OF IT. It is one of the new pillars of the economy that you can participate in to improve your lifestyle.
19. Changing regional climate dynamics is one of those things that sounds impossible at our current stage

of development, and yet we already know how to do such a thing. We just don't know that we know how to do such a thing because the idea of it is so big it's something we've never even considered. Changing regional climate dynamics is part of the picture for increasing water and food security all over the world, and it will create trillions of dollars of new commerce. This one is going to be a bit of fun for me at the beginning because I get to "freak out" a whole bunch of climate and oceanic scientists with the superficial details; alas it won't last for long because they will then start to think about it. And of course I've just ruined that little joy by saying it here; oh well.

20. Increased recreation infrastructure happens inside CODIN as part of bringing LDCs up with the rest of us, but this one inside developed countries won't happen to the degree of being able to include it as ANSR commerce unless we switch over to the NECS.
21. There will be many other possibilities from other H3 reforms, and there's no way I've thought of everything.

There is a term in journalism called burying the lead, and I'm going to finish off with the "mother of all burying the leads" - burying it after two big sections about ANSR and at the very end of this document - by stating the obvious (the obvious after you review these commerce options properly). **ANSR on its own will give us a global economic growth rate well over five percent into the foreseeable future**, and you can tell just by reading this Addendum that if we adopt CODIN and the NECS, that growth rate will be significantly higher again, assuming CODIN and the NECS do what I say they do in the books. They will, but of course you must adopt a wait and see approach on those two.

Forget about CODIN and NECS for the time being because even though you get some details in the Save Steps book (quite a lot on CODIN) the fully integrated details of those reforms will not be unveiled for about two years. This new approach to Climate Change is what you're being asked to support, and although it is

only me at the beginning of contacting people about this, as I say in the [Eden book](#), I need 20,000 people working with me to help me do it; heart, soul, brain and body. We get to 350 people by the end of the second year and the numbers start to head into the stratosphere during the third.

This is something new; a completely new approach and a “new language” for how to deal with our biggest problems that runs with human nature, rather than the complete disregard of human nature every approach to our biggest problems has always shown; when your opponent in a given situation or problem has 95%, 98%, 99% of the power, what has ever made us think that fighting them or asking them to give up some of what they have could have a happy ending. It’s time to try something that doesn’t go anywhere near either of these things.

However one wants to characterize this new approach to Climate Change, it cannot be characterized as just more of the same with a different person driving at the front of the bus. Help me get this thing up on its feet so that we can start the process of actually fixing this problem.

Sean Gallacher
0424 529 885
61 424 529 885
abc@h3hq.org
www.h3hq.org