

Test Contrarix

Taylor Ealand: We are live anything you say can and will be held against you in the court of public opinion. Although I don't know what we're going to say,, that will get us in trouble today. If anything, we might get in trouble with the right more than the left, but

[00:00:21] **Kyle Hermann:** I know, crazy

[00:00:22] **Taylor Ealand:** how that works. I know. Right. We'll see how that goes.

[00:00:24] Today we're talking about conservation , at Kyle's request. So I really am not entirely sure what I'm about to get myself into. I know generally, you know, as, as people , I tend to believe that I'm more of the environmentalist than Kyle, and we'll see if that holds true today. But since I don't really know where we're going before we get started.

[00:00:44] I want to do it quick plug store dot contrarix dot com. If I thought about it, I would of wore it. We have shirts. We have mugs. We have sweatshirts. We have products you should go check them out. Some of them are cool. Some of them are just our logo and so they're less cool, but still representative. And I won't keep them there for long, but store dot contrarix dot com if you want to support the show.

[00:01:00] Monetary and get something out of it. That's not, you know, like a membership. We don't Patrimon as everyone else does Patrimon and it's whatever. Also you can find us at contracts on most outlooks in most places, and that's pretty much it I've been on more shows, contrarix.com. We'll eventually have a place where all of Kyle and I's , guest appearances can be found if you want to find more of us because you've been listened to all of contrarix and you need more of our voices.

[00:01:28] That's probably going to be a week or two. So that's everything I care about plugging right now. Why conservation, Kyle, why are we talking about this this week? This is not like you.

[00:01:38] **Kyle Hermann:** Oh, are you kidding? See Taylor. I, I don't know. He might just be learning this about me, but I'm an inner environmentalist at heart.

[00:01:46] I guess the difference is that I just don't fall under the environmental preferences of the left. But I think for all intents and purposes, I am a conservative environmentalist. So the reason I'm really thinking about it today for one is that I was looking for a really good birthday present yesterday.

[00:02:07] And I came across the America, the beautiful federal lands pass and the San Diego county level version of that, which is just a parking permit for all the county parks. And when I ended up getting a hold of these two things, I thought what a freaking cool thing to have. Of all the different things that I could buy on the internet buy off of Amazon.

[00:02:32] This was like, man, I'm going for this. And I love this. And I went down to the county building and bought it yesterday and got the permit. And I am just so stinking excited

to go visit all of the county parks, all of the federal lands. The, I didn't get the state one yet because it's very state of California.

[00:02:52] It's very expensive. But for the most part, right, I just love the idea of getting to go to all the national parks, natural or national lands and all these sorts of things. So when we were trying to pick a topic last night, it was really the first thing on my mind is parks open space and kind of the adventuring and recreation that comes along.

[00:03:17] **Taylor Ealand:** So you're using politically charged terms when talking about environmentalism. And I suppose I want to step away from that a little bit. So let's define our terms real quick, because I'm not suggesting that, you know, the left or the right has, is, you know, has the bulwark of environmentalism. So when you're talking about being an environmentalist, what does that mean?

[00:03:37] **Kyle Hermann:** I think it means being responsible with our resources, you know, but it's also acknowledging that there are resources out there for us to use. You know, the, I saw today when someone said, save a tree, you know, scan the QR code and look up the menu online instead. Well, sure. There might be opportunities to not have to print something out and use less paper.

[00:03:59] I, I get that, but at the same time, realizing that, okay, we can cut down a tree, we can plant a new tree, you know, that we can do it in a responsible way. Still use paper, that sort of stuff. So I'm just saying that I fall into the responsible category where we should use our resources. But we should not abuse our resources and we should be smart about how we do it and not decimate the land that we're trying to use or anything like that.

[00:04:32] **Taylor Ealand:** Gotcha. So I say, I, I understand the take of- it's take that I often associate with Christianity with the whole we're masters of the land and should be able to use that type of logic. I'm not sure I buy into it wholesale. I mean, sure. The tree is there, but the return time on a tree is 30 years. Was the menu really worth it?

[00:04:55] **Kyle Hermann:** You plant more trees too.

[00:04:57] **Taylor Ealand:** You can always plant more sure. But like there, there, there is a discussion to be had about an efficient use of resources and a QR code with a device that everybody is carrying around anyway is much more efficient than printing menus. But you know, in the grand scheme of things, it's not the menus that are killing the trees.

[00:05:13] It's the volumes upon volumes of papers that corporate companies are using to file away and never see again, because paper is king in some industries, I actually experienced this in my internship. You know, a lot of things got printed off and just kind of like, I guess some of you are 80 year old attorneys, but please just stick it on the computer.

[00:05:29] We don't need to print off four copies of these, a hundred page memorandums. Like it's just ridiculous. So, you know, if you're really concerned about the, the laminated often laminated paper menu at the restaurant. It's not the thing to be most worried about, but in the same token, I mean, when I see a QR code at a restaurant, I use the QR code.

[00:05:49] I mean, it's just a more efficient use of resources. And frankly, I'm used to seeing things on my phone anyway, and it makes it to where the restaurants are able to be environmentally conscious as well as change up their menu more often because they don't have to print. And in most cases, laminate using plastics additional menus.

[00:06:06] **Kyle Hermann:** Yeah, no, I mean, not to get too stuck on the, that example, but, you know, that's what I mean by responsible is just making the best decisions. But understanding, you know, it's kind of the difference between like, you know, understanding, I guess, for example, that you can go out in the forest and have a bonfire, right?

[00:06:25] You can have a campfire, as long as you're burning, you're not burning, you know, cans of paint or anything like that. Fire is natural, right? You even though, the smoke and all this, that is a completely natural process. So it's the difference, I guess, between saying no, we shouldn't have any impact on the environment whatsoever.

[00:06:45] And being able to say, well, there are forest fires that happen without man's help every single year. So, you know, a campfire and a forest with natural wood and natural fire, is not an inherently bad thing. You know, I guess that's, that's kinda what I'm getting at is understanding our place in nature and not being, so I guess what I'm trying to push back on from the extreme sides of this.

[00:07:13] So from the left would be the people who are very extreme in the sense that they would wish that humans didn't even leave like a footprint in the dirt because they think that that's going to like change the course of history and like the books that we read in middle school,

[00:07:29] **Taylor Ealand:** I think that's an extreme fringe.

[00:07:31] **Kyle Hermann:** So the people who honestly do hold to the idea, though, that humans are, are necessarily bad for the environment. Anything that we do that is outside of what we think is the natural order. Like we are having a bad impact on it, right? So we shouldn't go into the forest. We shouldn't walk anywhere. We shouldn't even go near them because we are going to have a bad impact on, on the land.

[00:08:05] And I see this there's places around here, that are completely barred off to humans. And I looked on the website and it. People, this has been barred off because, you know, people are just going to destroy it. And maybe there's a specific circumstance that they're talking about or what, but it was that idea that saying, okay, humans and this place, which is just hiking trails are a bad combination.

[00:08:30] And I thought, no, we can do better than that. We can make it so that humans can interact with this area and everything we can all live in harmony.

[00:08:43] **Taylor Ealand:** We'll come back to this cause I, I disagree with you. But you said a peculiar statement and I want to make sure we're on the same level with understanding when you said that there's a, we have to understand our place in nature. What is our place in nature?

[00:08:58] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, we're here on this earth. We have resources. Like we go out and fish and we can fish for food. We can hunt for food. We can, you know, do those sorts of things. This is kind of going back to our , vegetarian, vegan shtick , from a few weeks ago. But I'm just saying the difference between , you know, going out and fishing and saying, look, there's plenty of fish in the sea.

[00:09:21] Let's go out and fish them, get some food versus saying, Nope, we, we shouldn't go out. And fish. That's kinda where I'm saying our place in the world is, is interacting with.

[00:09:32] **Taylor Ealand:** But when we look at the number of fish in the sea, there's not as many as we think; we've destroyed the biodiversity in the sea. You can't just go out and fish and you can't just go out and fish.

[00:09:44] If companies are pouring out, you know, billions of tons, millions of tons of toxic waste into the ocean, killing the fish. I mean, it's not that simple, you know, we know, you and I can't just go out and find fish. There are no fish to be found and the numbers are getting worse and worse as time goes on.

[00:09:59] And we're not sustainably , allowing fishing, fishing isn't happening on a sustainable level. When we're looking at the grand economic scale of trying to feed 7 billion people. So I don't know if I even agree with you. You know, what is our place on the planet? Because in the same token, I kind of do fall more in line with the logic that we are, that we are ultimately creatures of the planet.

[00:10:21] We are one with the planet. We cannot leave this planet and we affect this. And, you know, it's, it's one thing to say, if you're like, well, we're the top of the food chain. So, so fish be damned. It's like, okay, fine. Sure. We, we are the top of the food chain and we're going to affect , environmental change as being the top of the food chain.

[00:10:35] But in the same token, our changes are killing ourselves as well. And, and we are upsetting a delicate balance. I mean, with your logic, it sort of stands to reason: well, we can extract the fossil fuels out of the ground and therefore we should be able to do so. And it's like, well, no, not if there's better methods of energy generation available to us which there are , and there's debate as to what those are, but there are, and I don't think it's appropriate or ethical to be extracting resources from the earth to the scale that we're doing.

[00:11:07] So. Being sustainable about it. And this isn't necessarily a human issue, which maybe this is where you and I have overlapping agreements. This is more of a cultural one. You know, certain cultures are better about sustainability than others. The native Americans understood this very well and understood the importance of the land and the animals and everything that they sort of interacted with.

[00:11:26] Now it's dismissed as animalistic, but at the end of the day, they understood the value of the resources that were given to them by whatever you want to call it. And they tried their best to keep the balance of nature sort of in play where now, -and this is a more Western capitalistic issue -we don't hold the same value to land.

[00:11:47] I mean, you're talking about , we're going to keep people off of this land because people are ultimately going to destroy it and you say that's not inherently true. I think it is right now because when we do let development go without any repercussions or any insights into the land that we're developing on.

[00:12:03] Yeah. We destroy ecosystems. Now. There's always a balancing act, you know, what's, what's the return on the destruction and sometimes it's worth it, but sometimes it's not, and I'm not sure we know when it's not worth it.

[00:12:17] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, so let me, let me clarify two things. One, the specific reference that I made about that piece of land was that they've boarded off entirely.

[00:12:28] So no one's allowed to walk on it. It's not building there's no, no traffic whatsoever.

[00:12:34] **Taylor Ealand:** Sure.

[00:12:35] **Kyle Hermann:** So even though it's a huge, huge land preserve. So that was, that was my key on that is , I wasn't proposing any actual buildings, just access

[00:12:48] there.

[00:12:48]

[00:12:48] **Taylor Ealand:** But even people walking, you go on the trails in the Sierra Nevada, you go to bald mountain, you go to , Rubicon trail, you go to Yosemite, you're going to find humans disrespecting the land.

[00:12:58] Even though there's a general understanding that we should respect the land. I mean, if you let people walk on trails, they leave behind trash not everybody does this obviously, but what you're preaching is sort of idealistic because if you go on a beach, go to a California beach and you stick around at the end of the day, there's going to be trash on the ground, left behind by people who do not care.

[00:13:18] Maybe they're everyday Americans. And they think that their individual choices don't matter in the grand scheme of things. And maybe in the grand scheme of things they don't, but they still add up over time. And it's just easier to say, no, you can't enjoy this because you can't be trusted with it. I think in certain situations where we're trying to regrow what we have destroyed, it might be the appropriate response.

[00:13:39] **Kyle Hermann:** Hmm, that's interesting. I mean, I would view it more as the, the gun-free zone logic for some of these places. You know, you can put a fence, you can put a thin barbed wire fence around this place, but people who don't care about the environment are probably going to hop the fence anyway. So I don't know.

[00:13:57] I, I think I would just rather focus more on even opening it up. Here's I guess, where I'm kind of turning my logic is opening it up. Maybe even charging fees for it. Right. I'm even willing to go that far and, you know, give it organization, give it , park Rangers and

volunteers and all this sort of stuff so that there can be people who go out and make sure that the park is clean.

[00:14:25] And that the area is clean after it has been accessed. So. I'm still, you know, advocating for responsible use of it and obviously punishment of anyone who decides to do illicit things. But I just think people who like going out and spray painting rocks for, for fun are going to do it, whether or not they've been given real access to it.

[00:14:53] You know, people go and spray paint the freeway bridges, definitely not supposed to be doing that. And it's probably dangerous in some of the cases that they

[00:15:02] do it. Sure.

[00:15:03] **Taylor Ealand:** But ease of access plays a role. I mean, you and I know those alma mater had a guard tower. You and I both know that guard tower didn't do diddly squat, but you really don't think that it didn't do anything at all. Just by purpose of being there just by the purpose of the rule exists.

[00:15:18] **Kyle Hermann:** Oh, what I'm I guess what I'm saying is in that sense now, There's nobody to take care of it, right? Like, because the park is just closed off, which is this big land. If you get caught. Yes, you you'll be fine, but there's just, no, there's nothing out there.

[00:15:40] So there's probably just as much going on, but there's nobody else out there too.

[00:15:46] **Taylor Ealand:** You're you're, you're assuming that just because you're not as a member of the public allowed to go on the land that the state doesn't have the authority to send out, Rangers are researchers out there, knowing how these places tend to operate, that's not what's going on.

[00:15:58] It's monitored. They want to keep the public out of it because the public trashes things, now, you know, whether or not it's right and wrong, that's a fair point to go back and forth on. And you know, in my libertarian perfect world yet, and you and I should have the right to go wherever we damn well, please.

[00:16:10] And as long as we enjoy the earth, but there is. A valid concern because this does happen all the time. Everywhere people don't take, take care of their surroundings, go to a dilapidated part of San Diego and tell me I'm wrong. Those people have a vested interest in keeping their streets clean. They don't, for whatever reason you think you, but you assume that if they go to a re a reservoir or a reservation or conservation place that they're going to treat it any better.

[00:16:44] **Kyle Hermann:** No, I'm just saying that there are people who will treat it well. And so. You know, to give them access. I don't know. It's, it's hard. It's a, it's a balance. So I, I totally hear where you're coming from because we've opened up some places to the public and we do exactly what I'm saying. Right. We monitor it, we try to clean it up when it gets trashed, then you know, we kind of appease the public.

[00:17:10] And then there are some places that the public just isn't allowed to go because the state wants to the state or the county, or whoever wants to just preserve it altogether. I

guess I'm coming from a more altruistic view that I do just wish that , I guess I don't really disagree with you. I just wish that we could be in a position to be able to open up any sort of land and be able to either trust the public or have people rally together.

[00:17:46] Right. Like kind of the hikers or the , I don't know the , the bird Watchers, those kinds of those types of groups to be able to go out and maybe pick up the slack for where other people have fallen short. And I will just say I'm biased. The reason I get so fired up about this one specific land preserve is that it's very close to my house and the hike , would be very, very cool.

[00:18:10] And, and the other thing, okay, this is why, let me add on, there are radio towers at the top, so it's just slightly ironic, slightly that the government says, oh no, no, no people can't be around here because , people are going to destroy the environment. Oh. So maybe we shouldn't have , telephone wires running up the side of the mountain and big radio towers up at the top.

[00:18:37] Oh, you don't want people near the radio towers either. Okay. Just save that. But it's, it's just kind of this, this hypocritical, it doesn't sit well in my stomach because they're saying, oh, no, people shouldn't be here at all. And then it's like, yeah, but we have like communication installations throughout this thing.

[00:18:57] So I don't really see what you guys are getting at. And there are, there's a paved road to get to that thing too. So it's not like it's this pristine never been touched , open space area. There's actually the huge type of , power lines that run through it too. So it's just like, well, if we can run power lines through it, I think we could maybe put in a few trails or something.

[00:19:23] **Taylor Ealand:** Sure. I mean, I'm not with you on it, but sure. Okay. Well, you, you made a point at the beginning of this conversation to say that you're a conservative , environmentalist as opposed to a liberal one. And that clearly means something to you and I, this is one of those issues. I don't think it should be political.

[00:19:40] But it clearly is. And you and I also understand that the, the conservative environmentalism liberal environment is, do believe in different things. Because politics is that stupid, but what does that mean to you?

[00:19:52] **Kyle Hermann:** Kind of going back to what we said before, I think that we should conserve , I love the idea of having parks and open space and , making sure that our land is clean and not excessively polluting or anything like that.

[00:20:08] So even what you said about overfishing , I don't, I don't disagree with you at all. I think the company. Should be taking responsible action. You know, I'm not advocating for the companies to do that. They either, there's a lot that can be said about, you know, overproduction over fishing, over all sorts of things.

[00:20:28] Just go to a grocery store and see how much it's sitting out and how much it gets wasted. So I'm with you on all that? I guess my difference when I say conservative , environmentalist is that I maybe just don't fall into the extremist , apocalyptic

environmental worldview. That's kind of like the scene in the Simpsons where if you throw one more piece of trash in the lake, then the lake is gonna , swallow up and the squirrel is going to come out with 37 eyes.

[00:20:57] I think that we should strive to keep the lake clean. But at the same time, We are able to live harmoniously. Yeah. You know, and I guess the other way that I've put it in the past is that the earth itself is strong. And we should obviously respect it, but it kind of goes back to the, the bonfire example that, you know, we can take those sorts of actions.

[00:21:28] We can go out and fish, we can have, you know, fires, we can have all these sorts of things if we do it responsibly and we do it, you know, in moderation and the earth will be able to handle it.

[00:21:47] **Taylor Ealand:** And my context for, we will handle whatever we throw at it. The question isn't about the earth, the question really at the end of the day, it's about us.

[00:21:53] **Kyle Hermann:** Yeah. And so my context for this really , just to maybe frame it a little bit better is kind of, like I said earlier about the forest fires, right? Are our boys in red who put out forest fires are some of the best in the world. So shout out to Cal fire for all that they do. However, there are places where forests burn without human help and without human hindrance.

[00:22:20] **Taylor Ealand:** Yeah. Okay. Yeah. So you keep saying things like this, but when you're losing scale, they don't burn the way that they've been burning even naturally there wasn't frequent fires every year,

[00:22:31] **Kyle Hermann:** because it's that, and you're right. It's because of that exact reason it's because when, whenever there's a fire, we put it out.

[00:22:40] No, because we don't want it to burn down our houses. So there are places that burn and they burn naturally, and then they don't burn for a long time, but we put out fires when they start. And so they, so the, we have interrupted the national or the natural process

[00:23:02] **Taylor Ealand:** that would already be happening you're after the natural process long before the fire even started, buddy.

[00:23:06] Ah, no, you pick, you're picking an order. I knew this conservation episode might've been, might be more contentious than you think it will be. You don't understand the scale that humanity has on the environment as is right? Because no, it's not like sure. Let things burn. That's fine. Most of the places where fires are burning, even in California are burning and uninhabited lands.

[00:23:31] That's not a big issue level. And also you're, you're disregarding the part where we actually do purposely create fires. We do controlled, burns all the time, and that's perfectly normal. And there are environmental reasons for doing that. However, when you have his poor forge forge forest management, and you're letting dead dry, organic matter accumulate on the ground, because you're not willing to let the loggers go in and clean up

the space a little bit while also being environmentally friendly, because loggers traditionally are, we're not the rainforest we never were.

[00:24:07] And you let all this matter. Accumulate these fire spark. They get really hot, hotter than they are in their natural counterparts, really fast. And they burn way more than. This is, you know, made worse by the effects of climate change, which I was going to get to eventually, because now there's less rain to naturally put the fires out or to naturally keep the ground more moist or whatever it is that would normally contain these fires, which does have a significant human impact on us and on all.

[00:24:38] And, you know, we have, we have a significant impact on climate change. We'll just see which you can argue is not making it hotter here. I mean, it's the middle of June and we hit 110 degrees here in Fresno. That is not normal. I never was normal. So to say something along the lines of like, we should just let it burn.

[00:24:58] No, no, no, no, no. You're what you're so far late in the chain you've missed the forest from the tree.

[00:25:03] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, I don't think I'm, I don't think I'm disagreeing with you here. So, you know, even the fact that you're elaborating is not necessarily a point of contention. I mean, because you bring up exactly what I was trying to get at.

[00:25:16] I guess I was just pointing out one specific point in that chain. And it's exactly what I was saying. When you, for environmental reasons, don't let loggers clear the forest because you just say, Nope, nobody's touched the forest. Don't look at the forest. Don't even sniff the forest. Then that sort of stuff starts to happen.

[00:25:37] I just use the example of the fire itself when you actually get to that point. But I'm just saying

[00:25:45] **Taylor Ealand:** on climate change,

[00:25:48] **Kyle Hermann:** I mean,

[00:25:54] I don't know. You start, it's a political

[00:25:56] **Taylor Ealand:** issue. You have viewpoints. No, no, no, no, no, I'm not. I'm not you, you know where I stand. You made it a point to say that you're a conservative environmentalist, you, you, which means that you believe in quote, conservative policies, whatever that means. I'm not entirely sure.

[00:26:09] I know what that means because Republicans don't do shit for the environment.

[00:26:15] Where do you stand on climate change? Generally. Open-ended question take that where you think it needs to go.

[00:26:22] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, I'll take it kind of both ways. One is we need to do what we can to be responsible, which is what I said on the flip side of that. And why I will tread lightly

on this question is that on the flip side of the climate, right on the flip side of the climate change debate, you have people who think that the world is going to end.

[00:26:51] I mean, literally some of the books that have been written about this are like, guys, we're, we're done with this. If we keep on this track, then we're going to be, the earth is going to implode in seven years. Something like that. That's the kind of thing to which I say, well, then there's nothing that we can do right now.

[00:27:14] If, if the world's going to end in seven years because of what we've done to it, I can guarantee you. We're not going to reverse course on it in the next

[00:27:24] **Taylor Ealand:** humans have a significant impact on the global temperature.

[00:27:31] **Kyle Hermann:** Oh, sure. I think, I think we should do,

[00:27:35] **Taylor Ealand:** should humans use the government as a tool to enforce the, to prevent the deterioration of the, of the environment?

[00:27:48] **Kyle Hermann:** The only caveat that I will put to this is that.

[00:27:56] And this is why we're having this conversation is because when I, when you say humans, I think of the, the general population making these decisions. I think people will, I think people in general don't know which things we should or shouldn't be using. That's that's kinda that's so that's, so that's, that's why my answer is the way that it is, because we say to the government as the general population, we say , you know, we should ban , we should,

[00:28:39] I don't know. We'll just say let's ban it. Paper bags because we want to stop producing paper bags. Right? Okay. So then the companies by necessity, because they still need to give out some sort of bag say fine, we'll we'll produce plastic bags. So when I, all I'm saying is that we don't always understand the other side effect of our decisions when we use the government to enforce environmental policies.

[00:29:12] And we should be very, very careful. Right. So I'm not, I'm not saying no, but I'm

[00:29:19] **Taylor Ealand:** saying it should be.

[00:29:24] Yeah, it should be. It should be watched. I understand governor Newsome's decree executive order to ban the sale of new gas cars. I think it's 2030. It might be later though. Yay or nay.

[00:29:49] **Kyle Hermann:** Is that your question or did you have more? Yeah,

[00:29:52] **Taylor Ealand:** no. Governor Newsome's ban on the sale of new gas cars. It's either it's at least 2030 and may be further out yay or nay.

[00:30:02] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, let me, let me just turn it to you. What are the side effects of using only electric cars

[00:30:10] **Taylor Ealand:** is forcing automotive companies to produce electric cars at a scale because of one state, because it believes that the trade offs of producing batteries is better than the trade-off of releasing a continued stream of CO2 and other greenhouse gases into the air.

[00:30:38] The trade-offs have been.

[00:30:41] **Kyle Hermann:** That's my question, I mean, in general is, is that trade off worth it because how it is sold to the general

[00:30:52] **Taylor Ealand:** you want, the answer is the trade-off worth it. Kyle, based on what you know is the trade-off worth it. I don't tell you my answer, but I don't think I should go first.

[00:31:02] **Kyle Hermann:** So on this matter, I am not an, I'm not an expert.

[00:31:07] I am a member of the public. Okay. So I will, I just have to disclaim that I am going based off of what the general conversation says. Okay, sure. To which I would say at this point, I am not confident in the trade-off because of the production of batteries, the production of the cars and the production of electricity.

[00:31:31] So, you know, we we've been sold since we were younger on solar energy. That's great. I'm not opposed to solar energy, right? And so we have this simple mindset that electric cars, solar energy, we all lived happily ever after, but even as a member of the public on this issue, I still go, wait a minute. There is manufacturing involved up to the point of taking in solar energy.

[00:32:03] So there's, there's something hiding in the closet here that it is not abundantly a cleaner industry by introducing electric powered cars.

[00:32:19] So I

[00:32:21] **Taylor Ealand:** wouldn't have done the

[00:32:21] **Kyle Hermann:** executive order. I'm saying if, if we can truly put our confidence in renewable energies, which as greatest. Aspire to be are not fully there yet for one. Because they have side effects of their own, like putting a solar farm in the middle of the desert that beams sunrays up into, you know, cause the air to be like 250 degrees or something like that.

[00:32:53]

[00:32:53] **Taylor Ealand:** In a small area that has no, it has no bearing on most life, let alone human life. So this is, this is where you make the insinuation that you think you're closer to me than I really think you really are because no, this should be a pretty clear answer. So do you, what do you do not, or do you, okay, let me, let me, let me, do you, or do you not support governor Newsome's executive order on the ban of new gas, new only new, you can still sell old ones, new gas cars after whatever that period of time is.

[00:33:25] **Kyle Hermann:** Right now, no.

[00:33:26] **Taylor Ealand:** Okay. Now do you, or do you not believe that the government should, in certain cases, inf you know, use its monopoly of violence to enforce environmental policies? Yes or no?

[00:33:45] **Kyle Hermann:** I'm going to go with your libertarian streak on this one and inclined to know,

[00:33:50] **Taylor Ealand:** I actually thought you were going to say yes on that one. So this is where my libertarian streak goes out the window. Cause it's just a stupid way of looking at it. Do you believe that the government is at times the only viable player to do certain tasks?

[00:34:05] Yes or no?

[00:34:08] **Kyle Hermann:** Wow. You're turning me into a libertarian on this show. How dare you, Taylor?

[00:34:17] Yes. Yes, on the government only being able to do certain things.

[00:34:24] **Taylor Ealand:** Why is protecting the environment or at least starting the protection of the environment, not one of those things,

[00:34:31] **Kyle Hermann:** because the government isn't necessarily better at it. It's not

[00:34:35] **Taylor Ealand:** about being better. It's about being the only one able to do it.

[00:34:39] **Kyle Hermann:** No companies are able to do it.

[00:34:41] **Taylor Ealand:** No companies are not able to do it. Tesla is only profitable because of government incentives.

[00:34:47] **Kyle Hermann:** It is, it is within the business. Owner's interest to be able to have farm land to farm on next year.

[00:35:00] **Taylor Ealand:** Sure. But business owners don't think about 30 years or 40 years or 50 years down the line.

[00:35:06] Not necessarily, especially business. The farmer is going to be more prone to think like this. Absolutely. They hatch fund that owns the farm. Not so much. They won't.

[00:35:19] Because that's the, that's where we're at in society. You know, right now I'm pissed off a ton because BlackRock is buying up properties throughout the entire country to make it to where people like us will never be able to afford homes. It's bullshit. It's not capitalistic either in certain things, the government is well suited to tackle.

[00:35:38] And I do believe that a wide-scale short-term plan to get us on the track of sustainability is one of those things. Now, you and I probably agree in certain policy decisions, like I think providing the foundation of our environmental policy on solar and wind is shortsighted and naive. It shouldn't be nuclear in a perfect world fusion, and the

government should be spending billions and billions of billions of dollars to make that a reality.

[00:36:07] It's not, but it should be. And you, and I would probably come to agreement if I explained the benefits and why, and you're probably already inkling to do so. Cause I do know you however, to also say like, there aren't like you, you do this weird wishy washy non-answer with governor nuisance order as if you know, the, the, the, the trade-offs is the term you use, isn't worth it.

[00:36:28] It's like, okay, but we have a dependence on gas and gasoline and on fossil fuels, even if it's coal, like we have a dependence on dead stuff that was buried in the ground. And there is an inherent issue of pulling carbon out of the ground, lighting it up and then letting it go into the air and not putting it back in which we're not doing a good job of putting it back in at all.

[00:36:55] So then you had let this carbon accumulate and it makes it to where there's like, now this, the blanket on the earth that is the atmosphere is getting thicker and thicker and he is getting trapped in and it's going to fry us. I mean, maybe not us, but it's going to fry certain environments. It's going to melt the eyes.

[00:37:13] It's going to raise the ocean and that's going to have consequences. I believe the trade-offs of destroying multiple ecosystems is greater than the fact that you might have to buy an electric car in 10 to 15.

[00:37:27] **Kyle Hermann:** No, that's not what, that's not my emphasis on that. My emphasis on that is that I am not convinced as a member of the public, that electricity is right now, or even in 10 to 15 years, 10 times cleaner than gas production as it is because we only think of electricity coming out of the wall.

[00:37:49] And we think of the quiet car driving by and not seeing a tailpipe on it. So that's what the populace is thinking of clean. But what about the factories that produce them and the factories that produce the batteries and. Everything that leads up to the car, actually being on the road,

[00:38:09] **Taylor Ealand:** take a step back and think about this.

[00:38:11] Logically, everything that's been produced has is going to have fossil fuels involved in it. Sure. But now it's no longer a hundred percent fossil fuels. It's no longer even 90% fossil fuels because we've, we have always had electro power, hydro-power and stuff like that for a long time now. But as we move more and more towards electricity towards solar, towards wind towards ideally nuclear, the dependence on gasoline or on fossil fuels to power the electricity generation, which you are pseudo correctly, pointing out, is lessened because you have more and more renewables in the picture.

[00:38:48] Right. Does that make sense? How is it then that if some, if we know some of the electricity is produced by renewables, if not a significant portion of it is produced by renewables, how was an all gas car better than an electric car, which does have a significant

upfront costs and electricity production because of the batteries, which means there is a significantly more upfront costs in the fossil fuels being used to create them.

[00:39:21] But over the long-term it takes like something five to 10 years, depending on the car is still a net positive over an all gasoline car. How was it that you prefer the all gasoline model?

[00:39:32] **Kyle Hermann:** I'm not saying that I'm like a pro gasoline advocate,

[00:39:37] **Taylor Ealand:** then what is wrong with governor Newsom's order?

[00:39:40] **Kyle Hermann:** The, the thing with it right now is that it is in, okay.

[00:39:47] So the executive order is set for, I guess, nine years, right? I'll check

[00:39:51] **Taylor Ealand:** it, but it's something like that.

[00:39:53] **Kyle Hermann:** It wasn't, yeah, I think it was 30 or 30. Maybe it was 20, 35 might have actually been 20, 35. I'm just saying standing right here right now. It is hard to see how we would, how we would be able to make that transition.

[00:40:10] And I guess just looking at it from a layman's perspective, seeing the way cars have evolved , over the past 50 years, we'll say right from, yeah, from the gas guzzlers of the 1950s to now. So 70 years, I don't actually see a great evolution in that. And quite honestly , and so I guess I just, in that way, I'm not optimistic.

[00:40:43] In, in our capabilities of how we're going to, I don't know. Maybe that doesn't make any sense at all, but

[00:40:51] **Taylor Ealand:** it doesn't, but I feel like you're coming from a place where you just say, I don't say this to be rude. I don't think you know what you're talking about.

[00:40:58] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, I told you I'm a layman

[00:41:01] **Taylor Ealand:** on this. Even laymen who have experience would be able to dispute what you just said, because the sense of fifties, there's been significant improvements in gas efficiency, which has been in, which has only existed because of government interference.

[00:41:15] This is one of those weird places where again, the government isn't any is in a unique position to stop something from happening. If we let this is why I'm not a pure capitalist. If we let companies do whatever they want to make the most profit in the least amount of time, they don't consider long-term ramifications.

[00:41:32] They should, but they don't. So the government has stepped in and put an emission standards has put in requirements, you know, on power, on power versus.

[00:41:43] Versus consumption. They put on, you know, you have to hit these targets for , particulates that are coming out of the tailpipes. You have to require catalytic converters. You have to do all these things, which these companies did not want to do. It was bad for

business, but because of these, because of this, because of these regulations, the world is cleaner, is more environmentally friendly.

[00:42:04] LA is not as covered in smog as it was in the seventies. That is huge. We don't,

[00:42:12] **Kyle Hermann:** this is where I, I guess LA is a great example because this is where I'm a little bit of a cynic. Okay. Is LA has improved, but LA is also the example to me of it should be better than it is because California has had its time and LA has had its time to implement all the policies at once.

[00:42:37] No one is stopping California from implementing all the policies at once too. And why is LA still smoggy?

[00:42:44] **Taylor Ealand:** That's what it does for some reason, environmental, environmentalism is political,

[00:42:50] **Kyle Hermann:** but there's no one to stop LA from doing whatever at once. Yes, there is. There's no, there's no Republican, essentially

[00:42:56] **Taylor Ealand:** the car companies in Detroit to make a better cars to where when you bring them in, they don't dirty up the

[00:43:03] **Kyle Hermann:** air.

[00:43:03] You sure can because because of the California car standard across

[00:43:08] **Taylor Ealand:** the country, or which has the backing of the California government and the California government enforcing a gasoline ban is going to significantly affect the entire country. The Bose, because California has the willpower to do it, which it doesn't always have.

[00:43:24] I mean, California is more than LA and San Francisco, and these are political issues and people are considering votes when they're thinking of palsy. And for some reason, uniquely in this country thinking environment,

[00:43:36] **Kyle Hermann:** Yeah. Yeah, that's, that's kinda where, that's why I'm a little bit more of a cynic. I'm just saying, I don't know why.

[00:43:43] I don't know why. And I will, I will say being in San Diego. Okay. San Diego is as relatively clean air. And I think we've done. I don't know, San Diego's

[00:43:58] **Taylor Ealand:** relatively cleaner has not as much to do with your policies down in San Diego. As much as it has to do with your geography. All of your dirty air goes in the ocean or goes inland.

[00:44:09] Fresno does not have clean air. The cars here are no different. The people here are relatively, no different. Our electricity generation. Isn't all that different. We live in a bowl and we get smog and it's killing us quite literally giving us lung cancer and shorten the lives of older populations in Fresno, in the central.

[00:44:30] Do not confuse San Diego's relative success with better policy, because there are places that benefit from geography because that's how the

[00:44:38] **Kyle Hermann:** earth works well. So I guess I'm still not disagreeing with you on this matter is I'm saying that it is places like LA and Fresno that need to figure out what they're going to do.

[00:44:55] You know, it isn't, I guess I can't be as sold here in San Diego for that reason, but LA needs to figure out how it's going to not. Smog trapped in his bowl like it is, and they need to, but LA

[00:45:13] **Taylor Ealand:** is the smog in LA. The smog and froze now is being created by machines that are not produced here. And without them, we wouldn't be economically viable.

[00:45:22] Anyway, we have to have tractors run to grow the farm, to do work. The fields that grow the food that you and San Diego get to enjoy. So to say that it's Fresno's problem is stupid because it's not, it's, it's a human problem. This affects all of us. This is one of those issues that legitimately affects every single human being on the planet.

[00:45:40] There is not that many of those issues, you know, this in like nuclear warfare, and that's basically it to then say that it's on the it's on the onus of those who are most heavily affected so that you can keep living the life you want to live is sort of ludicrous because no, that's not,

[00:45:54] **Kyle Hermann:** that's not exactly what I'm saying.

[00:45:56] I'm saying for the, for the businesses in Los Angeles and the businesses in Fresno, it, it should be. They're concerned to figure out how to be cleaner, right? It should be everyone's. It should be everyone's desire. I'm saying by virtue of living and owning a business and, or owning a business in LA, we'll say it should be Las high priority to produce a clean environment.

[00:46:36] **Taylor Ealand:** It can't LA doesn't operate in a vacuum. The machines don't come from LA. They come from Mexico. They come from Canada. They come from Detroit. They come from China, Japan, Korea. They don't come from LA. How are they supposed to do it? It's not Elway's responsibility to solve climate change. It's all, all of our responsibilities.

[00:46:59] Now there are

[00:46:59] **Kyle Hermann:** policies. We're not just talking about climate change, that we're also talking about the immediate impacts of, of smog and air quality.

[00:47:11] **Taylor Ealand:** It's all the same. It's all connected.

[00:47:13] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, no, I'm, I'm not saying that San Diego shouldn't take part in developing a cleaner production. I'm saying that LA by virtue of its geography needs to figure out what it is going to do to keep the air clean.

[00:47:34] **Taylor Ealand:** I think you're on a track that goes nowhere because there's no way for them to do it with the system that you're trying to create. The way we clean up the air, not just in LA, but everywhere is to enforce cleaner standards for everyone because there, you know, if we can prevent a car dumping, tons of lead, we did this with lead was bad.

[00:48:00] Lead was very bad lead. Was it, you know, there's why there's unleaded gas. It was releasing all kinds of pollutants that were lead in the air. It was killing people. And we decided none of that create a technology that doesn't use lead and companies did because the government told them to how was LA supposed to do that?

[00:48:16] When now it's not lead, but it's excessive greenhouse gases that we're pulling from the ground and not putting back in that is the new pollutant. How was this any different and why is it that it is on the onus of communities like LA and Fresno to figure out their unique problems when their unique problems are caused by literally everyone, including San Diego, because your habits in San Diego are influencing the commercial habits of companies that are multinational, that are producing cars in LA.

[00:48:47] That is leading to the small, okay.

[00:48:59] **Kyle Hermann:** I'm saying from a capitalistic standpoint, there can be a,

[00:49:11] we should have ours struggling because it doesn't work. No, I'm just saying we should have our , we should like do two rounds of the podcast. One where we battle out our ideas first. Anyway, I'm saying that based on supply and demand, if people in LA don't like smog, then they, they need to use their consumer power to, yeah.

[00:49:43] My point is that it should not fall entirely on the government. I'm saying that companies have the ability and have the opportunity to make these , Make a cleaner environment possible and that it is not ultimately the government who will or can do it. Absolutely. Government is

[00:50:04] **Taylor Ealand:** not the end all be all the government is at, at the very least the starting point the government has to enforce the rules.

[00:50:10] Government has to make rules, enforce some rules. Now we, you and I all the time are knocking the government because they make stupid arbitrary rules that shouldn't be enforced. So it's not like I'm saying that every time government makes rules they're legitimate. However, there are situations. But the government is in a better position to enforce change.

[00:50:28] And there are some changes that need to happen. We know, based on scientific data, based on the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the effect that these greenhouse gases are having on our environment, we know that the path we're on right now is not sustainable. Long-term you and I may live our lives in relative safety, I suppose, but it's going to kill our grandkids.

[00:50:52] If we don't change the government is realistically the only body that can force the change because you're talking about consumer power of Los Angeles and sure. Politically for California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles is a huge part party in the grand scheme of GMC. Not so much, they don't have that much consumer power, especially when the rest of the world doesn't necessarily care about what we'll say, Angeles, think about cars.

[00:51:18] So they're just going to buy whatever. And GM's going to produce more of those because it's way more profitable. That's forcing Los Angeles. That's forcing Fresno to buy the worst alternative. If they want to be able to be relevant. The, the, the, the purely capitalistic scheme, which I wish would work, doesn't work here.

[00:51:36] This is one of those areas where pure laissez-faire capitalism fails because it's not in the interest of the long of the short term profits of major companies, which do not give a flying F about you or I to produce electric cars, because they're just not as valuable government is in a unique position to further the development of the technology required to.

[00:52:01] These electric cars more viable. That's why when you buy a new electric car from Ford and for a while, Tesla, although they've used up their reserves at this point, when you buy a new electric car, you get a tax credit provided by the government to further the development of these cars. And thanks to policies like this.

[00:52:21] There are companies, not just Tesla, but now a major player Ford making electric cars. And it would be naive to think that they would do so if it wasn't for the structure in which government provided to allow them to do so and still be profitable, because it is not profitable to be an electric cars as Tesla look at the way that their company is run and tell me where their profit comes from.

[00:52:42] I can tell you where it comes from. It's not the cars, it's the tax credits and that's huge. That's not bad per se. There are certain things I think the taxpayer should pay for it. Making sure that our grandpa kids can live is a good starting point. And the government is the only person, the only group with the power to enforce these companies to do this, especially when the governments are teaming up to tackle an issue that we know is going to affect you.

[00:53:09] Now, you have a valid point about the point about the general public, not having all the data and that's fair, but you know, that's just as much in the general public's fault too, because you could have access to all this information. It's all out there on easy to watch YouTube videos that make it plain as day of what the data says.

[00:53:26] We know that gasoline cars have a lower carbon footprint at production. That is not the problem. The problem is throughout their lifespan, which is quite long, they produce more carbon than the electric alternatives. If you only use a car for five years, the electric one is worse, but cars don't get used for only five years.

[00:53:46] Maybe you only use yours for two or three or four before you turn it in, but cars have a longer life than that. So over the grand scheme of things, they produce much less carbon. And when you factor that out to a whole societal scale, that's a significant impact,

especially if we can get the technology to the point where we can put it in things like semi-trucks, which produce way more carbon emissions because of the prevalence they have on our roads.

[00:54:08] But that isn't to say that we shouldn't try or shouldn't enforce policies to get us towards that future faster, as opposed to letting the free market do its thing when it feels like it, which isn't going to be until it's too late, because it's not that type of issue. This is a slow gradual buildup,

[00:54:25] **Kyle Hermann:** I guess, where I'm maybe trying to call back on your libertarian streak here just for the purpose of these ideas is, again, not that I really don't like the idea of electric cars.

[00:54:39] But just to say, like right now with California environmental policies, this is something I heard. This is not something I've researched. Okay. I asked someone at a car dealership who, whose goal is to like, you know, sell cars. I asked them how long a car is supposed to last, how many miles a car will get.

[00:55:01] And they said, brand new cars off. Now we'll last about 120 to 140,000 miles because of the restrictions that California has put on them. So the car itself now, a gas car, barring the conversation about electric cars, specifically a gas car is now like living half its life that it could have before.

[00:55:26] And we're having to produce another one. If you buy a brand new gas car today, you're going to have to buy a new one in six years because of the policies that are wearing down the cars because of the technology that have been put in them because of the, all those sorts of things,

[00:55:46] **Taylor Ealand:** too simple. Sure. There, you could maybe argue that the cars aren't built the way they used to be.

[00:55:51] And part of that is intentional. And part of that shift is maybe a side effect. However, is not necessarily a case that you have to buy a new car after 140,000 miles. What gave out was at the end. Well, the transmission, wasn't the brakes. Can you replace the part and not the whole car? And even if you know, cars used to last two 50 and now only lasts one 20, but they live, you know, on 20% of the old cars emissions in the process, it's still a net positive.

[00:56:20] It's still a win. So no, you can't simplify it. That much cars too complicated of a machine. And you'd think these cars are complicated. Look at the electric cars. They're freaking weird. There's more motors, there's more parts there's batteries. And now we have to keep that in mind. I'm sure there are trade offs is sure it's not perfect, but it's better.

[00:56:44] And it's not going to get any better than it is currently without dealing with what we currently have. So you also have this like weird mentality where you're saying right now, it doesn't make sense. So we shouldn't do it, but if we don't do it right now, it's not going to get better at the same pace that it would with the policies in place to incentivize people, to

buy the products so that the research departments get the money they need to make better products.

[00:57:06] You lose, no matter what

[00:57:11] **Kyle Hermann:** I mean. I guess one of the key things here though, is that, are we still operating under the possibility that electric cars or the electric car industry is not the best way to do it, or it is not actually.

[00:57:34] **Taylor Ealand:** There be better solutions. The question is whether or not these better solutions are economic or, or available, look in a perfect world, you know, the way that I see things and the way that I understand the science in a perfect world, it'd be algae farms and biofuel, but turns out that's not really a scientifically feasible right now.

[00:57:54] So we have to decide, we want to pull more gas out of the ground or make batteries and make electric cars and try and make the grid as sustainable as possible. At least until we can get a better solution or maybe make this a solution that makes it longterm viable.

[00:58:12] Yes. We're pretty sure that electric long-term is better than gas. Is it perfect? No, that would look more like hydrogen or like I said, biofuel, but that's not. You know, it's like saying, well, we shouldn't do solar or wind until you, because we could do nuclear. Sure. But for some reason, society has determined that vision nuclear reactors aren't exactly viable.

[00:58:34] Long-term. So until we get fusion, it's better than nothing.

[00:58:40] **Kyle Hermann:** I know. We just shut down recently. We've shut down more nuclear nuclear plants. Really interesting book, which we talked about a few weeks ago, is apocalypse never by Michael Shellenberger. Not saying that, you know, a hundred percent full endorsement of everything he says in it.

[00:58:57] If you go to, you know, if you choose to go out and read it. But I guess what I really pulled from it and kind of my basis for this conversation is. Really at the end of the day, the complexity. And in fact, the politics that do actually go into the, the altruism. We'll say of some of the policies in California, that California policies are not always as, as good as they seem that it, it really does come down to motives sometimes, and that people aren't always necessarily making the best decisions.

[00:59:35] So I'm advocating

[00:59:37] **Taylor Ealand:** the question isn't in, nor it shouldn't be whether or not it's as good as politicians make it out to be. Politicians always make things better than they seem to be. The question is whether or not they're better from the current status quo.

[00:59:50] **Kyle Hermann:** Well, without, without going into too much detail about the book, he, he basically was laying out the fact that the crusade against nuclear was.

[01:00:04] By vendettas that people had specific motives

[01:00:09] **Taylor Ealand:** for crushing, I guess nuclear was incorrect as a policy decision, but, but, but then that's something that we should be discussing, not whether or not, you know, should we really be considering these policies that we are considering because a, there are potentially better ones available or B because we're not sure about the consequences.

[01:00:26] It's like, well, yes, we should still be pursuing those because right now, because conservatives refuse to seriously take on the nuclear conversation, nuclear, isn't an option. You and I can pontificate all we want on the fact that nuclear would be better for a whole number of reasons than it's actually safer than all of the different methods.

[01:00:44] Even when you take account that the drastic , examples of nuclear destruction, like generable like the like CUNY a tall, like a nuclear, no, the Japanese one, whatever, like whatever one speaker Shima, even when you consider those nuclear is still the better option as far as the amount of lives lost. We can't have that conversation because conservatives are unwilling to actually do so on any initial level.

[01:01:05] But we do have policies that are better than the status quo, which is still support those while we work on, I suppose, a better alternative, but that's not happening. I mean, you're, you're sort of operating, which is funny. Like, I feel like the positions are a little flipped. Normally you're the more realist and I'm the idealistic one.

[01:01:20] We shouldn't be operating based on the realities of the world, especially in this situation. And you're kind of not, you're taking this more idealistic ultra, do you use your own terminology? You're, you're taking on an altruistic approach. That's not going to work. So I don't really know what to do with that because at the end of the day, you're wrong.

[01:01:44] And I, and again, your, your most valid point is that the public doesn't have the biggest grasp on the issue and that's fine, but we also, you know, are we, do we expect them to like the public doesn't agree on abortion and that's. To us a pretty clear cut one, you know, is life valuable or not. So to then expect the public to, you know, spend the hours and hours and hours and hours of time, it takes to understand this issue, to read all the videos, to read all the videos, to watch all the videos, to read the literature, to understand that when you pull carbon out of the ground, I mean, this is a hard concept for certain conservatives, which I do not understand.

[01:02:22] You pull carbon out of the ground, release it in the air. Don't put it back in and carbon makes things hotter. What follows? Oh, it's natural. No, it's not.

[01:02:34] **Kyle Hermann:** I guess, I guess I'm taking it past the, the public position on this too. To what I said about the politicians is we, we're also putting our faith here in the California politicians. When, like I said, our, our own California politicians will run out. Fought against nuclear that we both know would be a better option.

[01:03:01] So I guess this is where my skepticism comes in. I'm just, I, I'm not saying that there aren't better options. I'm not saying we shouldn't pursue the better options. I'm just saying we have better options and one we've shot them down. We're still shutting down nuclear plants to this day. And to, well, I mean, that's kinda the, that's kinda the big one for me is if, if we're going to rest in the ability of the government to make the best

environmental decisions, then I have some concerns because our own state government is already not making the best environmental decision.

[01:03:48] When it has options

[01:03:51] **Taylor Ealand:** better than a status quo when the option that you would prefer is not available because of public opinion. If you want nuclear, that's all fine and dandy. So do I go out there and convince the public to vote in people who are pro-nuclear, but that's not what happened? We can point and do what about ism and point to, you know, the bad acts of prior people and say, well, this, because of this, we shouldn't do this.

[01:04:12] That's not what we have to work with. What we had to work with is the here and now, and what's viable now. And what is viable now is electric cars as opposed to gas cars. And we have politicians who are willing to put their political careers on the line. I hope Newsom loses his political career, but not for this reason, but there are really to say by 2035, no more we're done in the story, make electric cars because that is better than gas cars.

[01:04:42] And we're going to talk about, you know, viable options. I don't know— putting a nuclear reactor in a car is feasible, but if we made nuclear. Produce the electricity and then put the electricity in the electric cars, as opposed to having a gas cars going around. That's still a hell of a lot better than the alternative.

[01:04:58] I don't understand the argument because you're going in too many different places at once when you're what you're really, it sounds like what you're really saying is I don't know if it's best, so we shouldn't do anything at all that doesn't work. It's not going to work. Long-term, it's going to affect our kids.

[01:05:11] And that should matter to you. And I, I mean, it's not like we're disagreeing over tax rates. It's not like we're disagreeing over even whether or not to go to war, because that tends to be a more moral dilemma thing. This one's pretty cut and clear. Like if you actually know the data, you know, this is going to harm future generations and we are in a position to do something about it.

[01:05:32] Therefore we should, I don't know how in that equation you come out. We should. I just don't see it. Now, if you want to say coming out of the

[01:05:42] **Kyle Hermann:** thick, then coming out of it. I don't trust, I don't trust the California state government. To, to take such a sweeping action. Okay. Let's go back a little bit to what we've experienced the past year.

[01:05:58] We gave Gavin Newsome the pen to fight a pandemic and look at what he did,

[01:06:09] **Taylor Ealand:** but the pandemic climate crisis. No, you can't do that. You can't do that because it's like your view on abortion that they disagree with and discounted everything you say you can't do that. That's the tribalistic bullshit. That's infecting our country right now. You have to give credit where credit is due

[01:06:27] **Kyle Hermann:** to environmental policy.

[01:06:29] I'm saying if, if we are basing even this conversation off the fact that we trust an executive. For our future. And we're going to give the governor that much authority and the legislature, that much authority to essentially overthrow entire industry, even if we want, if, if we like the outcome. Okay. So we're going to give the state of California that much power.

[01:06:57] We should be very, very cautious about how we do that, because we've seen the way that our own governor with the stroke of a pen can decimate thousands and thousands and thousands of businesses and run a campaign on the fact that he did the right thing during the pandemic. That's why I'm concerned is because of exactly who we're talking about.

[01:07:22] I'm not even talking about it in the abstract. I'm saying we're talking about the exact same governor.

[01:07:27] **Taylor Ealand:** So you oppose nuisance order because Newsome.

[01:07:32] **Kyle Hermann:** I'm saying I don't, I would be very concerned about giving him that much authority. We're we're saying that he

[01:07:41] **Taylor Ealand:** can ask you whether or not you liked the fact that Newsome signed it.

[01:07:45] I asked you whether or not you like the policy, we need to separate the policy from men and women. There's a difference there. You can't engage in this bullshit you're doing because you're insinuating. If the Santa's signed the same thing at the same time, you'd suddenly be cool with it where you cool with the

[01:07:59] **Kyle Hermann:** policy.

[01:08:01] No, because the question originally was should the government be the one to take that action? And the government is not this, you know, this book that's out there. It is made up of people and legislators and you know, electric

[01:08:18] **Taylor Ealand:** holds the monopoly of violence to use a Michael mouse term. It's not like a corporation like apple, apple can't do that.

[01:08:25] So it has this unique

[01:08:26] **Kyle Hermann:** set of power. Well, yes. So under that same assumption that it holds the monopoly of violence, is that I'm saying for that very reason with our state, our government right now that holds the monopoly of violence that holds the monopoly of putting people in prison and shutting down businesses as they've done.

[01:08:51] I don't trust this California government with that much power. I'm not saying that the government, I'm not saying that the government can't do it. I'm saying it is scary to give our California government that much power, because then they can do. People who actually follow the science, I don't know.

[01:09:19] We're giving them a science thing and they can't even follow the

[01:09:22] **Taylor Ealand:** science, following the science. They're not following the science everywhere. Sure. Finding any that's why I'm saying separate the policy from the man. So if you're what I'm, I'm assuming this so, correct. My assumption if I'm wrong, but I'm, let's say we give all the same materials with Trump and Trump came to the same conclusion.

[01:09:37] Would you be okay with it?

[01:09:44] **Kyle Hermann:** I would. I would be more inclined to trust someone who is not Gavin Newsome, but it

[01:09:49] **Taylor Ealand:** isn't Gavin Newsom in 2035 Newsome isn't even empowered,

[01:09:53] **Kyle Hermann:** but he, he wrote the order.

[01:09:58] **Taylor Ealand:** I think, let, I'm thinking about a, let your logic sit with the listener

[01:10:01] **Kyle Hermann:** and let them no, he wrote, I'm saying he wrote the order that because it's not, it doesn't take effect in 2035.

[01:10:08] It's saying starting now by 2030. That car companies need to start doing this because in 2035, this is what's going to come down on you. That will be the policy. Yeah. You had an issue

[01:10:24] **Taylor Ealand:** with the man, not the policy. You don't know the science that you can't even say. They're not following the science because you don't know the science because you are okay.

[01:10:34] You're more inclined to be okay with it. If a Republican signs it, that doesn't make any sense. We have to stop.

[01:10:39] **Kyle Hermann:** I didn't even say, I didn't even

[01:10:40] **Taylor Ealand:** say that you'd be more inclined to trust. You're right. I said Trump, but Trump is the Republicans right now. So I stopped with

[01:10:47] **Kyle Hermann:** Symantec for the actual question, not Gavin.

[01:10:52] **Taylor Ealand:** Yeah. And then I post Trump and you said you'd be more inclined to trust. So,

[01:10:57] **Kyle Hermann:** because what I'm saying is when we're giving them that sort of sweeping power, I'm agreeing with you in the fact that we can do this well, and we can do this responsibly. Well, I did do some, I asked you about. I don't think the state of California right now can do that responsibly.

[01:11:17] And this is because of the side effects that will come with over throwing an entire industry like this right now. Okay. We're not talking about 10 years from now. We're talking about right now when Teslas are \$90,000 or whatever they are.

[01:11:38] **Taylor Ealand:** The Ford Mustang Maki starts at 42. The Ford F-150 lightening is going to start at 40 with a \$7,500 tax

[01:11:45] **Kyle Hermann:** credit. There's Teslas that start at 30,000

[01:11:49] **Taylor Ealand:** Tesla model three. You should look it up. Well, that's good.

[01:11:52] **Kyle Hermann:** So,

[01:11:54] **Taylor Ealand:** well, nor Tesla, there are Chevy volts. There are Chevy bolts, which are both used in the market.

[01:12:00] There are Nissan Leafs, which are significantly cheaper. There are viable electric cars that are just as cheap as. Well, you know, gasoline counterparts, maybe not as powerful, maybe not as nice inside, but they're there. They are viable economically. They're making money. They are pushing the envelope. Sure.

[01:12:19] There are \$90,000 Teslas. There are \$150,000, I suppose. I'm sure somewhere, but that doesn't mean that just because those exist, that there aren't more viable options. Tesla makes viable options today. Now

[01:12:33] **Kyle Hermann:** we're, we're kind of going back and forth on our, on our scope of government here,

[01:12:39] **Taylor Ealand:** Tesla. Isn't where it's at today without government policy enacted by governments.

[01:12:44] Like California's like the United States, like Europe's Tesla wouldn't exist if it wasn't for

[01:12:50] **Kyle Hermann:** government, but the, but again, so going back to the companies themselves, you were talking about laissez-faire a minute ago, but the com the government did not produce these cars. The companies did. So

[01:13:04] **Taylor Ealand:** what I'm trying to.

[01:13:06] Companies do it because without the environment, they would have never have had the need to what I word would not be making the cars it's making today. If it wasn't for the restrictions that they see coming from the government, both in the present and in the future right now, because the government is in a unique position, regardless of who runs it, the government is in a unique position to influence change, not just regarding short-term profits, but for future generations, because it holds the monopoly of power.

[01:13:35] It holds the monopoly of violence. In a purely laissez-faire system, which is primarily looking at short-term profits. As a matter of fact, not a matter of principle, no, they would not be incentivized to make the cars they're making today. The Tesla model three is model wise, model Xs. And is there another one?

[01:13:55] S think I missed that one as well as the Ford Maki is the Ford F-150 is the Chevy volts and bolts. One of them is no longer being produced the Nissan leaf and the litany of

other examples that are coming from companies that we both know. And both don't know if it wasn't for government incentives, this industry wouldn't exist on anywhere near the same scale that it currently exists.

[01:14:23] And that's a matter of knowledge. I mean, that's not just pontificating about policy. You remove the incentives. Tesla goes under tomorrow.

[01:14:37] **Kyle Hermann:** Yeah. I mean, I guess it just really what it comes down to , on our philosophical underpinnings here is really just, I'm just posing the question, how much we want the government to be able to do that all the time. And it goes all the way back to the railroads. We, we see the railroads now and we like how the railroads operate.

[01:15:02] And it is the same situation. They were heavily subsidized by the government. I don't think any one company could really build a railroad across the United States by itself. They were given obviously substantial , subsidies with land and property and all that sort of stuff. And so the railroads wouldn't really be around without government interference.

[01:15:24] So I'm not fully disagreeing with you. I'm just saying. If we're going to give the government that much authority, then we just have to be ready for what else comes with it. Sure. We can say that we want all clean cars and we're willing to let the government do whatever it needs to. But I guess just my inner skeptic, especially from the past year of government interference is when the government says, look, look, look, look, look at how well we did overthrowing the car industry.

[01:16:02] And now we've produced all clean cars and you're like, yes, yes, thank you government. And they say, okay, now , we don't want anyone living in single family homes. That's where it is. It is a slippery, it is a slippery slope because yeah, we are giving the government authority and you think the government is going to.

[01:16:27] Take take less authority next time when we give them enough authority to, to radically change an industry. Do

[01:16:37] **Taylor Ealand:** you remember our conversation when we basically put out the idea and you agree with me, I believe at the time that governments are uniquely situated to take on large tasks and for task in which the private industry has already figured out they are objectively worse.

[01:16:51] Correct?

[01:16:55] **Kyle Hermann:** I don't. Do you

[01:16:55] **Taylor Ealand:** remember this conversation? Okay. Well, it wasn't.

[01:16:58] **Kyle Hermann:** Oh, I remember this conversation. Yes.

[01:17:00] **Taylor Ealand:** Okay. So then that was basically the conclusion that four tasks in which that the private sector just cannot compete like space travel in the 1950s, the government is in a better position. And once we figure this out, once we figure things out, the government is in a worst position.

[01:17:18] We saw this with healthcare. To point that out in a different term. And then 2.2 specific instances of abuse of power as a reason, not for the, as a reason for the government not to use its power when it is appropriate, when it is the best player is nonsensical. Because by that same logic, we shouldn't have allowed the government to do space travel in 1950 and 1960s because later on, oh, maybe they'll think that they're going to shut us down during a pandemic

[01:17:51] **Kyle Hermann:** and take away your business.

[01:17:53] And so then we,

[01:17:54] **Taylor Ealand:** I mean, I'm, I'm saying, I'm saying it is

[01:17:59] **Kyle Hermann:** as a well, but I'm saying as a, you know, as we are both, I know I'm not, I'm not digging at you because I know we're both, you know, constitutionalists and, And limited government in various ways. I I'm just, I'm yielding that part of my limited government, stick to say, we should just be very, very cautious because the government overall, which we know as, more limited government people at the overall, the government does not necessarily do things better.

[01:18:34] It does not inherently do things better than the general population or the market. So we have to be very, very cautious about what we give the government, the authority to do, especially when it's something as big as the car industry in California. I I'm not, I'm not fully or even really disagreeing with you in the sense that it could go really well.

[01:19:07] I'm I'm just saying it's a lot of power to give the government. And the state of California already has this power. So it's not like, oh, I'm S I'm scared about what could happen. I'm scared about what the state of California is already doing when, and going back to the, the shutdowns example, people are like, oh my gosh, this is so crazy that governor Newsome did this.

[01:19:30] No, it's not. It's not crazy because the state already had

[01:19:34] **Taylor Ealand:** it's a false equivalency is they're separate issues that have to be treated separately.

[01:19:38] **Kyle Hermann:** Not, not really because we're talking, talking about a government that has this much power across the board. It's not a government that is restrained. It's not a government that is acting in.

[01:19:50] Let's just say the state of California has a monopoly on Caltrans. Basically does. And it's like, well, our budget is going to Caltrans and the state doesn't really operate outside of that. So they have a big budget for it. They have a lot of authority over the freeways, but they don't operate outside of that.

[01:20:08] That's not true. The state of California does operate and operates in schools, roads, environmental policy in food, saved it in. It operates in all these sorts of things. One of the reasons that you could've gotten shut down during the pandemic was by the food

industry, by the , by the health agency that operates like for OSHA, basically it wasn't even a stay at home issue.

[01:20:32] It was an OSHA issue. So I'm just saying the state of California, exercising, not much authority is not really an isolated thing. And you can't really look at it separately than all the different things that they could do as. When they can shut down a public beach during the stay at home orders, it's like, you can shut down a beach.

[01:21:00] Okay. Wow. That's pretty incredible. That is a lot that the state already has the power to do. And by giving them essentially a blank, not a blank check, but like a blank law to fix the environment or to produce a better environment by the year 20, 40 or 2035. I just don't. I can't get on the train

[01:21:26] **Taylor Ealand:** blank, check a blank law.

[01:21:27] You're arguing a false equivalency and maybe you don't see it. That's fine. I've grilled you for an hour and a half. There's gotta be some questions you want to at least grill me on and then we can sort of finish up, wrap up.

[01:21:41] **Kyle Hermann:** No. I mean, this is, this is good. I

[01:21:45] **Taylor Ealand:** think the listener got a good , good look at my more moderate side.

[01:21:48] They probably go, like you always says he's moderate the libertarian streak and always sounds more like a libertarian. No, there are places for the government. And just so you know, fair is fair. I agree with the order. In fact, I don't even know if the order does enough. I think it might, maybe my 2030 is rarely where I think it should be 20, 35 is a long way away.

[01:22:07] You know, I think the government isn't a unique position and I think it is fair and appropriate to separate the different uses of government power and, you know, condemn the bad ones and condone the good ones. So I actually, in this regard do support governors because I try my best to separate men from policy and every now and then even a broken clock is right twice a day.

[01:22:29] And I think Newson was right. Maybe even two. I think, and this is why I knew like when you ever use, I think, you know, w we're more on the same page and you realize, no, I don't think we are. I think I'm a much more hardcore environmentalist than you. And although you and I may agree again on things like we should be pursuing nuclear.

[01:22:51] That's not the conversation being had right now because conservatives, the other political block don't even want to come to the table to the environmental question. They just want a block party of no, I'm not a party of no person. I never have been pisses me off. I want conservative solutions in the American sense, mopped up political sense of the difference clear, and those lines are using the government in order to foster development, because you know, the feds have the right to do this, and they did this with NASA and we should do it again with this.

[01:23:22] We should do it again with nuclear. That would be the American conservative thing to do, which is not libertarian. So I feel like the listener I'd see that. And keep in mind listener. I mean, Kyle and I, well, I mainly get heated. We're gonna come back next week around another episode, Kyle and I will still be emailing and texting back and forth.

[01:23:46] But man, do I think you're wrong on this one?

[01:23:50] **Kyle Hermann:** Yeah. Did the listener, if you think that this is somehow, oh my gosh, they disagreed on something. Wow. What's going on. I've now known Taylor for, let's see, four and a half years, four and a half years. Almost five years. So this is what we talk about on the air.

[01:24:07] Just imagine us off the air. So don't think that, something scary has happened here to date. It's actually probably been a long time in the making that we talked about something that actually got more contentious than usual. And this is why. This is why we do this. You know, we've probably mentioned it on our show before, but, you know, it's kind of a funny, two-sided coin of civility, how civility can both be contentious and, you know, like civility in itself is not like, oh yes, we're going to have conversations that we agree on everything.

[01:24:44] And no civility is actually disagreeing with a common trajectory, a common goal and a common friendship, and in what we do. And I think the key of this conversation, despite some major differences of thought and opinion is that Taylor and I are both, pushing for a cleaner future, and a better future.

[01:25:09] And the ideas that we hash out from now to then, are how we're going to get. So, yeah, so my, you know, my takeaway from this conversation is not like I'm going to cry myself to sleep at night because Taylor said I was wrong. Oh man. Yes. I can be wrong. And that's why we hash out these ideas. You know, we encourage each other to look things up, to do more research.

[01:25:33] And I think that's what we're trying to encourage. All of our listeners to do is to, first of all, you know, listen to podcasts, learn from the experts. We're not experts, I'm not an expert. But listen to experts, dive into whatever you're trying to focus on environmental policy, social pot, whatever it is.

[01:25:52] And become more well-versed on a, on a thing. So you don't end up speechless like me when Taylor is, one of your friends at a party, you know, trying to grill you on, on something. And you're just standing there like, aha. Yeah. Great. So anyway, no, I'll just wrap up with that, that I am, you know, I'm willing to be wrong or stretched in conversations.

[01:26:19] I'm not admitting defeat, in this, but I, I will admit when I'm stretched and confined new solutions to my, my old, my old ways of thinking

[01:26:32] and

[01:26:32] **Taylor Ealand:** this conversation isn't going away. I mean, on contracts we've had. We've tried to focus on certain issues. Like there are issues we keep talking about, we keep talking about China.

[01:26:40] And because I'm forcing that conversation because nobody else wants to talk about it. We will probably keep coming back to , climate change because it is a big issue. Whether or not, you know, you believe in it existing or not. It's a big issue that people talk about. Politically. I'm talking to the listener around necessarily Kyle here.

[01:26:53] We'll keep coming back to the societal issues. We'll keep coming back to all kinds of things. And I believe Kyle is wrong that doesn't automatically make him wrong. And he clearly believes I'm wrong on certain things that does not make me make me wrong. And that goes both ways. I think people are often afraid of disagreement and they avoid it.

[01:27:12] And how are we supposed to get any better without the disagreement? And what's interesting too, is , you know, I think oftentimes on contracts because I tend to lead the show that people see me commandeering and whatever that may be. People don't see , as much, especially behind the scenes conversations when Kyle has made me go ashy.

[01:27:30] I know when we met, I was much more libertarian my stance on pro-life. My stance on being more pro-life even through the use of government has changed partially and thanks to Kyle and his arguments. So just because you hear more of my assertiveness here does not necessarily mean that I'm always like that or that I'm always the one who refuses to back down.

[01:27:51] So thank you guys for listening. One more thing for both of us, and then I'll end the show with our usual plugs. What's something you're grateful for. And don't just rehash what you just said about disagreements.

[01:28:03] **Kyle Hermann:** Going back to the beginning. Why, why? I know why I even brought up this topic to begin with.

[01:28:08] I am, I am truly thankful for my discovery yesterday about these , Parks passes. It, it felt like a natural thing for me. I went straight up to the county building , and bought one of them without even hardly thinking, because I just absolutely loved the idea of getting to explore all the open spaces here in the county and getting the federal lands pass as well.

[01:28:31] Getting to go to some of the national parks I've already since buying it yesterday. I've already been listing out places that I really want to go first priority. A lot of them are a little too hot for summer, so I don't know how that's gonna work, but there's so many amazing parks and lands out there that I want to go and visit and see.

[01:28:49] So I'm super encouraged today that I have a new opportunity to be able to do that.

[01:28:57] **Taylor Ealand:** Sweet. I'm thankful for air conditioning. It's hot here. And people are probably tired of hearing about how hot Fresno is, but Fresno is hot. We hadn't, the, this might be the coolest day in a week and it's a, it's a cool 97. So shoot me now, who has

always, you know what you can do if you enjoyed the show and leave a review five star review for boy subscribe so that you hear more.

[01:29:24] If you're watching on YouTube, same thing, subscribe, drop a comment. Maybe I'm right. Maybe I'm wrong, but Kyle's right. Ms. Colorado, let us know your opinions. Maybe we're both idiots and we're both wrong. You can lay out your opinion there. We all know the comment section tends to do that. Drop a, like drop a dislike, leave a subscribe, all the things that promote engagement.

[01:29:41] We really need to the little push in the best thing you can always do no matter where you're at it. Share the show and tell your friends who you think should be listening to us. Hey, go listen to these two people on the internet. Best thing you can always do for contracts. If you want sports that monetarily, you can find us@localsandyoucanalsofindusatstoredotcontracts.com.

[01:30:01] I would suggest going to store because then you get a cool shirt or a mug or something out of it. But if you just want to donate money and you don't care as much about material things, locals, probably the best way to do it. Patrimon has seen very little activity, so I'm probably just gonna kill it and leave it at that.

[01:30:18] Anything else before we go, any final words, Kyle?

[01:30:21] **Kyle Hermann:** I don't think so. We've got a lot of words in this show. That's for sure.

[01:30:24] **Taylor Ealand:** You got a lot of words in this. And like I said, I don't know how we're going to get in trouble for it or words of anything we're going to piss off conservatives and that liberals.

[01:30:30] And if I'm going to piss off a group of people, I am much less afraid of the conservatives. Know they don't cancel ,

[01:30:34] **Kyle Hermann:** conservatives. Don't cancel. That's good. Yeah.

[01:30:37] So

[01:30:38] **Taylor Ealand:** thank you for listening. We'll see you in the next one.