

Date: Thursday, June 30 2016 08:07 AM
Subject: RE: FYI re supposed climate task force
From: [Redacted]
To: Jack Gerard [Redacted]

Redacted

From: Jack Gerard [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 6:10 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL]RE: FYI re supposed climate task force

Redacted

Hope you are well. Best, Jack

Sent from my iPad

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 2:39 PM
To: Jack Gerard
Subject: FW: FYI re supposed climate task force

Jack,

Redacted

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 10:47 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL]FYI re supposed climate task force

Redacted

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Redacted**
Date: Wednesday, June 29, 2016
Subject: I tried calling you
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: **Redacted**

My number is **Redacted - Privacy**

If the task force is secret, I won't comment on whether I am involved or not (I don't discuss relationships with clients or potential clients).

However, I am happy to say what I would advise this task force or anyone else: make the moral case for fossil fuels. That is, frame the climate influence of CO2 as part of the overall impact of fossil fuels on human flourishing--not as a standalone issue. Talking about "climate change" as a standalone issue without discussing the unique benefits of fossil fuels is as constructive and honest as talking about the side effects of prescription drugs without discussing their benefits.

Additionally, the task force should demand the precision and clarity that is so absent from this debate, which uses "climate change" as a manipulative equivocation between the demonstrated mild warming influence of co2 and a wildly speculated warming influence of co2.

Redacted