



rRemarks Data for February 7, 2023 Village Council Meeting

Agenda Section: Mayor's Report

Agenda Item: A. 2022 Annual Report

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on Council Chair's MLK proclamation

At VC's last (and only January 2023) meeting, the VCC (village council chair) opted to reprise verbatim his 2022 proclamation for MLK Day.

So I will reprise mine, with some small alterations.

Jan 16 was Martin Luther King Jr Day in the US.

At VC's Jan 10 meeting, the VCC gave a proclamation calling for a day of service. in my 2022 response I noted that such a call was a classic version of the sterilized, milquetoast way in which white America — especially the well-to-do part of it — wishes to remember and memorialize the life and work of Martin Luther King Jr.

I further said that I didn't believe King and his supporters were marching and subjecting themselves to physical attack and risk of death so that more people in the US would be motivated to work in a food pantry or soup kitchen, paint the walls of a senior center, or render some other service to each other.

I went on to say our country still does not have a national community service entity because the Republican Party part of it believes such an entity would likely pursue objectives and engage in activities it opposes. Better to have the principal —indeed sole — focus of promoting unity in the country be the military, and the fomenting of paranoia about and the waging of war against all those foreign nations who fail to appreciate ours is the exceptional nation, God's gift to the world.

So here we are over 50 years after MLK' untimely death, assassinated at age 39, and much of what he struggled for remains still to be done.

King pondered the obstacles he faced, and was coming to believe 'white well-meaning moderates' were among them. In what has become known as his Letter from Birmingham Jail, in 1963 he wrote the following:

"I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in the stride for freedom is not the White citizens' 'Councilor' or the Ku Klux Klan, but the white moderate who is more devoted to 'order' than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension than to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says 'I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can't agree with your methods of direct action(;)' who paternalistically feels that he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a 'more convenient season.' Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is more bewildering than outright rejection."

Last year at VC's Jan 18 meeting, the VCC issued a further proclamation calling for a "civil rights week." I applauded the VCC for issuing that further call. This year, the VCC issued no such call, perhaps worried doing so would antagonize the Christian nation conservatives he hopes will vote for him in the upcoming election.

Last year I fleshed out the VCC's supplemental proclamation and extended it, on the grounds King's work did not end with what we refer to as 'civil rights.'

Specifically, I said I hoped the VCC's proclamation included a call for

a day of self-examination, both personal and institutional, to assess one's relationship to racism and other forms of exploitation.

a day of reconciliation that explores how to heal the deep wounds of our nation's history and shrink the racial, ethnic, and class divides.

a day of empowerment, in which people are encouraged to examine the impact past suppression of African American voting has had and discuss what needs to change if voting in our democracy is to be not something we fight over but something we practice as a key part of the joint responsibility we call self-governing.

a day of peace and restraint, in acknowledgement of King's opposition to the Vietnam War and American militarism more generally; for us, an opportunity to assess among

other things how it is our nation's self-image contrasts so dramatically with its interminably acquisitive and belligerent behavior in the world. to assess how all too many of us have a facile capacity to dehumanize in the name of any of a range of motives, from self-aggrandizement to pursuit of higher good.

a day of justice and opportunity, in acknowledgement of King's recognition that fighting to overcome poverty was a way to unify and uplift poor people of every color. A day, in other words, in which we examine why our democracy has failed to ensure equal educational and economic opportunity, medical care, and safety in one's person. in which we investigate what must happen for our society to stop using poor people, especially poor people of color, as the safety-valve whenever the capitalist economy needs a downturn in order to undo its excesses.

a day of dignity and equality, in which we assess why our capitalist economy has failed to deliver higher standards of living for so many and not only failed to reduce inequality but worsened it, and explore how to change these failings in order to allow each of us to provide for and contribute to our individual and collective well-being.

finally, a day of environmental sustainability, in acknowledgement of King's opposition to materialism, in which we examine to their very core the workings of the capitalist system in order to figure out what needs to change in both the public and private sectors if we are to prevent the ravages of our present environmentally unsustainable way of living from devastating not only the poor, regardless of race or ethnicity, but every single one of us.

As is VC's usual non-response to public input, none of that happened.

MLK Day as a day of service? That's about the least white America can do to honor Dr King.

Agenda Section: Mayor's Report

Agenda Item: A. 2022 Annual Report

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on VC's January workload

Given the nefarious deeds VC was engaging in a year ago around this time, in the Longfellow property fiasco, should we be pleased or disappointed VC met only once in January this year?

Perhaps enough of them had pressing “family obligations,” they couldn’t muster a quorum.

With an election coming up, let’s hope voters recognize the importance of putting into office individuals with more intelligence, curiosity, and integrity than the current bunch has shown.

Agenda Section: Mayor’s Report

Agenda Item: A. 2022 Annual Report

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on VC Exploring DG Joining Greenest Region Compact

At VC’s sole Jan meeting during commissioner reports Comm S-F put forward a motion to VC for staff to explore DG joining the Greenest Region Compact (GRC).

GRC may be thought of as the local government version of the international effort (known as COP) to cut CO2 emissions and other effects deemed harmful generated by the entities’ political economic activity.

Sadly, for all the fanfare each receives, both the international agreement and the local agreement are toothless.

In particular, they are voluntary in their goal-enumeration and provide no enforcement mechanism for those who miss their goals. And they leave untouched key issues such as subsidization to entities who through no fault of their own are most at risk of the harmful effects of climate chaos. Not surprisingly, CO2 emissions since the beginning of COP meetings (going on 30 years now) have continued to relentlessly increase.

GRC has been around since 2007 yet according to VC’s council chair (CC) prior VCs have seen no reason to join the compact. Feigning being open minded about the matter — after shutting down the ECC hard as one of his first acts as CC — and tipping the outcome of the vote “to consider,” the CC voiced a willingness to explore joining.

Note the difference: the vote was not to join the GRC, the vote was to approve the gathering of information about the possibility of joining at some future date.

The voice vote to approve “exploring” was then a pro forma nothing burger. How so? Because it ...

- i) Gave no timeframe for making a decision.
- ii) Gave no indication of reasons for refusing/reluctance to join in the past and thereby no sense of criteria to be applied for a decision to join in this instance.
- iii) Handed off to staff responsibility for investigating the GRC, which means VC’s future vote will be hampered by the fact ‘staff’ lacks qualifications, integrity, and enthusiasm to gather useful information on the matter.

Comm S-F’s proposal seems more a hail-mary effort going into the upcoming election to show herself as someone with a heightened interest in and some training about protecting the environment — in other words, an attempt to salvage claims from her initial candidacy after an entire term of failing to distinguish herself from her colleagues on the issue.

Other commissioner comments made prior to the vote, such as Comm K’s, suggested VC sees no particular need or benefit to joining.

Notably, Comm K mentioned VC had received numerous emails supporting the idea, but he complained the emails failed to appreciate “all that VC is already doing.” His simple-minded response citing VC’s planting of trees and numerous “green fleet” awards suggests he has learned nothing about the subject during the entirety of his tenure on VC.

Did the trees planted around DG offset the 100 year old trees VC was willing to see cut down to make way for private housing on the Longfellow property? Like all good pols, VC avoids asking such awkward questions.

“Green fleet” is a classic green-washing label so prevalent among energy producers and consumers. Like “clean coal” and “clean energy” nuke plants. Not that referring to certain endeavors as “green jobs” is all that instructive either.

Comm K did concede joining the GRC might give DG another opportunity to do what it does best: follow leaders and stay well behind the frontier of policies and practices in order to meet its primary goal of keeping property taxes low.

NO commissioner including S-F has shown ANY indication of any self-motivated effort to learn more or understand differently about ENVIS in order to overcome their current level of ignorance. Why not? By my assessment, because they deem it bad for their political well-being and for VC's business model.

VC undoubtedly believes its new village hall will be environmentally 'friendly,' but that presumption lacks data beyond a simple calculation of the expected improvement in energy consumption of the new facility compared to the existing one.

Other than Comm G's modest proposal for a 'clean streets initiative,' has any VC member proposed measures advancing VC's primary goal of ENVIS? None have shown any personal effort to educate themselves on the issues. Not surprisingly they continue to refuse to answer any of the core questions I have raised about ENVIS and VC's adulterated use of the term.

Did the new contract for waste removal broach the subject of reducing consumption within the village, as I indicated to VC was appropriate given its goal? NOPE, not even close. VC and staff acted as if the two have nothing to do with each other.

Ignorance may be excuse on part of other municipal entities, but in VC's case avoidance of issues and bastardized use of language is clearly intentional.

So should DG join the compact? And what difference will it make were DG to join?

In its past, VC has shown little interest in working with other communities unless doing so was likely to save money — via shared cost, procuring grant money from somebody, and the like.

Biggest problem in GRC is that it is ANOTHER example of the adulteration/bastardization of notion of "ENVIS."

Reminder: sustainability is a rates of utilization issue. "Protecting environment" is a head fake. Reducing CO2 emissions is a head fake. Shifting to renewable energy is a head fake. Each of these is important but unless addressed within an understanding of environmental sustainability (ENVIS) as a political economic issue, they predispose the effort to failure.

Our way of living is NOT ENVIS. It becomes ENVIS if and only if we use resources at a sustainable rate. Renewable and non-renewable resources alike.

Political and economic leaders do not use the term properly ... because they need to mislead. Why? Because using and understanding the term properly has huge implications for our conduct since our current way of living is NOT ENVS.

A major challenge of sustainability concerns the use of non-renewable resources. By definition, non-renewable means its supply is finite and shrinks when converted to human use. Economists claim we need not worry about that limit, however, because we will always be able to find a substitute. That's the key notion underlying claims in rich nations (and their constituent parts) that e.g. we need merely shift from fossil fuels to so-called renewable energy and we'll be able to keep going with little to no change in our way and standard of living. Take that claim with a grain of salt.

To remind: renewable energy currently makes up only a small percentage of total energy usage, both in the US and around the world. Furthermore, at the scale needed to replace fossil fuels, renewable energy relies on non-renewable resources, including fossil fuels, for its collection, storage, distribution, and end-use utilization.

The belief in endless substitution is grounded in a belief in technology, which is in effect a belief that human ingenuity is the most important and indeed an omnipotent resource, able to solve any and every problem.

This belief in turn is intended to mean humans need not worry about living within limits, either as individuals within nations or collectively for all humans. Further, the presumption is that the persons and nations most 'technologically advanced' deserve to live as they choose. Devil take the hindmost; that is, everyone need only look out for themselves without worrying about the impact on others.

That "climate change" has become the focus of so much political attention reflects these beliefs. Climate change is one aspect of ENVS, but not the whole of it. Climate change as an issue focused primarily on reducing CO2 emissions is a head fake diverting from the fundamental need to live within resource limits of every kind.

Coincidentally, the website resilience dot org provides a link to a handy example exploring claims about substitution vis a vis energy,

Nate Hagens podcast with Arther Berman on 18 Jan 2023 "Peak Oil — The Hedonic Adjstment":

<https://www.resilience.org/stories/2023-01-18/arthur-berman-peak-oil-the-hedonic-adjustment/>

Key ideas they discuss include:

- a) definition of oil for government tracking purposes has been expanded to include more than conventional oil aka petroleum,
- b) substantial portion of 'oil' (even using the altered definition) consumed by humanity has been consumed since 1995,
- c) even if volume of 'oil' (as redefined) has not yet peaked, because the definition of 'oil' now includes liquids with lower energy content per unit volume, the total volume of 'oil' being produced is yielding less energy content aka less energy-slaves,
- d) discussions about importing from and exporting oil to the US is usually oblivious to the nuance of the quality (type) of the oil involved — light v heavy, reflecting the fact that the US is unable to use all of the oil it produces because it's light. The US needs heavier oil, particularly to make diesel!!! It's the chemistry!!
- e) Natural gas plant liquids well production rates decline VERY rapidly. That is, the EROEI of the world's 'oil' wells is falling. Indeed, humanity is in a 'red queen' situation (a reference to Alice in Wonderland), which refers to the idea that increasingly more 'effort' (energy and material) is required to 'stay in place.'

Which is to say: the problem of peaking is twofold — the total amount produced declines and the proportion of the total produced available for usage for something other than future oil exploration and production declines!!! Including for the production of the infrastructure for so-called renewable energy.

I use the term energy-slaves to emphasize the notion that contemporary life especially in rich nations depends on a massive use of (energy-) slavery to do work. Unless one believes the supply of energy-slaves is indeed infinite, at some juncture, the supply will peak. To pretend otherwise is to pursue a path of self-destruction.

Or in the case of the US, a path of trying to subjugate and/or destroy others:

(as I have pointed out in previous comments) namely, the belligerent US actions toward most notably Russia, Iran, and Iraq. As the awkward question asks, "How did OUR oil get under THEIR land?"

Does the GRC recognize ANY of this reality?

Not from what I see.

Unless and until it does, VC signing on may make people in DG feel better; it will launder some consciences a bit. But it will have little effect on getting us out of our predicament.

The only way for DG to begin to solve the problem that our way of living is NOT ENVS is to elect to VC individuals prepared to take ENVS as a primary, serious, and genuine goal.

None of the current VC has displayed any such inclination.

Ignorance is bliss. Until it isn't.

Agenda Section: Mayor's Report

Agenda Item: A. 2022 Annual Report

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on Covid in 2023

Dueling narratives, dueling factions, dueling experts, dueling data. Covid edition.

On 02 Jan 2023, with the nation still in holiday spirits and much of it looking forward to the last Monday Night Football game of the NFL season, the game between Cincinnati and Buffalo came to a screeching halt midway through the first quarter when Buff defensive back Damar Hamlin went down in a heap, having suffered (we learned later) cardiac arrest. Thanks to the fact medical personnel were on hand and able to quickly give aid, he survived. He recovered enough in the weeks following that the nation was able to continue satisfying its bloodlust for American football, troubled only by its usual injuries and concussions but not death. Save that for the privacy of players' post-career struggles.

Others were not so lucky. Such as

Lisa Marie Presley, Elvis's daughter, who died of a sudden cardiac event on 12 Jan 2023. She was 54.

Actor Leslie Jordan, who died in another “sudden cardiac dysfunction” event on 23 Oct 2022. He was 67.

Their deaths may not be covid-related.

But they have become part of the ongoing debate about covid and the mRNA jabs given ostensibly to protect against the virus.

The pressure to get jabbed has been immense in the US and in rich nations around the world.

Remember, Australia prevented tennis great Novak Djokovic from playing in the 2022 Australian (tennis) Open, an event he had won more than any other player, because he had refused to be jabbed!!!

NBA star Kyrie Irving and NFL star Aaron Rodgers were prominent cases of US athletes ridiculed for their refusing to get jabbed.

Hamlin’s collapse set off a new round of exchanges between believers in and skeptics of the covid jabs. In part, because ...

Hamlin’s collapse came shortly after the sudden and unexpected death of soccer journalist Grant Wahl, who died 10 Dec 2022 while covering the sport’s premier event, the World Cup. Wahl had just turned 49 days earlier.

By coincidence his wife Celine Gounder is an infectious disease MD who is a very visible proponent of the jab. She took to the editorial pages of The NY Times on 08 Jan 2023 to denounce the idea — ‘conspiracy theory’ — that a covid jab might have contributed to her husband’s sudden death.

Her friend and colleague, UMinn epidemiologist and head of its infectious disease institute CIDRAP Michael Osterholm included discussion of the matter in his 12 Jan 2023 podcast #122.

osterholmupdate.com/podcast/episode/4b52f324/episode-122-shutting-down-misinformation

Starting around 38:30 of the podcast.

Osterholm stated flatly in the podcast there is no proof the jabs are harmful. He remains a believer/proponent.

In the US, and elsewhere, however, doubt is spreading, leading to skepticism both about the covid jab and about vaccines more generally. And to distrust not only of Big Pharma but of the medical community as a whole. And of government and of public health.

The skepticism toward jabs and vaccinations was substantial enough, it even merited a piece in 03 Feb online postings of The Atlantic magazine.

www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2023/02/us-covid-vaccine-obsession-future-variants/672933/

Also available here:

www.newsbreak.com/news/2913063893386/the-good-news-about-vaccine-hesitancy

As I have noted previously, given the various conspiracy theories to which Americans have been exposed, such as WMD in Iraq, it is hardly shocking those who bear the burden of the adverse effects of such deceptions are skeptical.

Now that we're in year four with covid, previously strict covid policies have been loosened or dropped by countries around the world. Even as Americans continue to die at a troubling rate with/from the disease, the Biden administration announced it is about to declare an end to the pandemic.

Among the nations changing policy, the most notable is China. It abandoned its zero covid approach of locking down cities/areas to prevent the spread of the virus when even single digit number of cases were detected. In response to citizen resistance to the zero covid approach, the government opted to let covid spread, thereby giving its citizens the option to lock themselves down voluntarily when covid came to their locale.

Osterholm criticized the Chinese zero covid approach and forewarned of its inadequacy as a long-term approach. But I for one am hard-pressed to assess which nation did worse, given the number in the US who have died given its resources and population size versus the number of Chinese who have died given its resources and population.

A key datapoint of concern among skeptics: evidence of excess mortality and morbidity during the pandemic years. Evidence visible enough that it became the topic of a NY

Times piece by David Wallace-Wells “There are still many more Americans dying than there should be” on 02 Feb 2023. His discussion deftly skirted the key concern among skeptics: the harm the jabs themselves are/may be doing.

So what do the skeptics understand/fear about the jabs?

Put simply, that they are dangerous ... in the short, medium, and quite likely long-term.

What is the data supporting such skepticism?

a) Rise in sudden death of athletes, normally among the healthiest of their age group. Not that it hasn't happened before, but it's the rate at which it's happening post widespread mandating of covid jabs.

b) Rise in “sudden unexpected, otherwise unexplained deaths.” Most notably the more rapid rise among working age people ages 16-64. Historically the healthiest portion of the population.

c) And the rise in disability among working age people.

Are the rises due to the jab?

As Ed Dowd argues in this video with members of the organization FLCCC, if it's not the jab, what is it?

[odysee.com/\\$/embed/@FrontlineCovid19CriticalCareAlliance:c/Weekly_Webinar_January18:1?r=9C8dc5pQmr8RQTgkFoYzGsLMEeXoLuJX”](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9C8dc5pQmr8RQTgkFoYzGsLMEeXoLuJX&list=PL8221)

While Dowd does not have medical credentials, his credibility is based on the fact he is someone trained and experienced to spot changes in patterns and trends before others do. He's applying that capacity to covid and the pandemic because he worries of the consequences if covid jabbing the population does not cease.

Why excess mortality in the working age population? A massive advertising/promotional campaign playing on everyone's fear of the unknown. Along with job mandates employers demanded for employees to keep their jobs.

Dowd presents his evidence in a recently published book: Cause Unknown.

His company's website has links:

phincetechnologies.com/HumanityProjects/Projects.htm#Nav_ExcessDeaths

Polymath Karl Denninger in his blog on 05 Feb 2023 discusses what might be going on to cause sudden unexpected deaths in the young and jabbed:

market-ticker.org/akcs-www?post=248031

Believers in covid jabs of course continue to claim the net effect of jabs has been positive — that lives were saved and hospitalizations avoided.

But as Dowd argues in the interview, skeptics believe Big Pharma fudged their data (they have a track record of doing this sort of thing). And Pharma never assessed longer term effects of jabs, an objective normally considered essential before government gives approval to widespread usage. In the US, jabs were given “emergency use authorization,” on the grounds no other option was available. Skeptics have from the beginning questioned that rationale.

The deeply skeptical, as Dowd suggests, believes the whole process was a psyops program designed to achieve precisely what has occurred in the US — widespread jabbing — as a way to reduce population, both now and in future. Up till now, the stuff of a science fiction plot.

If you look for it, you will find examples and data suggesting skepticism about the jabs is growing around the world.

For example, I recently came across a claim that Pfizer jabs were never used in India because a) India refused to permit their use without Pfizer first doing clinical trials, which Pfizer refused, and b) India refused to grant Pfizer corporate indemnity for any harm the jabs might do. Indemnity the company received from the US government.

In addition to concerns about myocarditis and pericarditis, the working hypothesis about jabs as purveyors of harm is based on evidence of the suppression of the immune system more broadly and on the lack of control over the diffusion of the spike protein within the body. In other words, the harm can show up anywhere. For example, some MDs report seeing cancers previously ‘under control’ suddenly worsening after the patient got jabbed.

I found particularly informative and thought-provoking on these possibilities an interview with Australian immunologist Robert Clancy by British biologist John Campbell.

youtube.com/watch?v=yMyERFBdB4E&t=8s

Of note, Clancy observed that compared to the normally great precision given to administering drugs to patients, in terms of factors such as dosage, time and frequency of administration, knowledge of its effects, and the like, NONE of that is true with the mRNA jabs.

Even Osterholm in his podcast #123 acknowledged the difference between jabbing in the case of flu, a seasonal disease, and jabbing against covid, a disease not yet so similarly predictable/definable.

Clancy suggested another important aspect of problem with mRNA jabs is unreliable manufacturing, that is, lack of quality control. Meaning the jabs themselves when administered are not the same!!!

His conclusion: the rush to jab negated the usual precautions that are supposed to be taken in order to ensure the efficacy and safety of a newly created jab AND the reliability of its manufacture.

What is going on regarding immune system suppression? Denninger talked about it on his blog back in Dec:

market-ticker.org/akcs-www?post=247709

Unfortunately this post is no longer available.

Try here for a similar discussion:

igorchudov.substack.com/p/booster-caused-immune-tolerance-explains

The issue: Repeated boosting is causing tolerance of the virus, i.e., it is causing the immune system to produce the wrong IgG response. As Denninger put it, jabbed individuals are being turned into virus mutation factories. The ominous question is whether suppression extends beyond SARS CoV2 to other coronaviruses. And beyond!

Is there anything that can be done to undo the toxic effects the jabs may be having? Do the effects wear off? Can they be passed on to a fetus? And so on.

One hopes the skeptical MDs and scientists are trying to find answers to these worrisome questions.

A key concern about such efforts in the US however: the vast majority of this type of research is funded by Big Pharma.

As I observed at the beginning of the pandemic, when the question at hand is as technical as that presented by a pandemic, even those who deem themselves educated are forced to act based on who they trust.

In that regard, the deeper pandemic problem of our times is the withering of trust.

It's everywhere. And there's no obvious remedy.

Other than perhaps re-starting with the basics — be healthy, be informed, be connected, be real (not self- and other-deceiving), be charitable.

And most importantly, be proactive in helping move our way of living to one that is environmentally sustainable.