



THE MORAL CASE FOR FOSSIL FUELS

The Key to Winning Hearts and Minds

by Alex Epstein

Founder, Center for Industrial Progress

Author, Fossil Fuels Improve the Planet

THE PROBLEM

Imagine you are talking to the VP of Communications for a tobacco company, who claims that he has a new strategy for winning the hearts and minds of the public:

- “We will explain to the public that we contribute to economic growth.”
- “We will explain to the public that we create a lot of jobs.”
- “We will link our industry to our national identity.”
- “We will stress to the public that we are addressing our attackers’ concerns—by lowering the emissions of our product.”
- “We will spend millions on a state-of-the-art media campaign.”

Would you be convinced? I doubt it, because none of these strategies does anything to address the industry’s fundamental problem—that the industry’s core product, tobacco, is viewed as a *self-destructive addiction*. So long as that is true, the industry will be viewed as an inherently immoral industry. And so long as that is true, no matter what the industry does, its critics will always have the moral high ground.

Sound familiar? Substitute “fossil fuels” for “tobacco” and you have the fundamental communications problem the fossil fuel industry faces.

THE MORAL CASE AGAINST FOSSIL FUELS

You might say that it’s offensive to compare the fossil fuel industry to the tobacco industry—and you’d be right. But in the battle for hearts and minds, you are widely viewed as worse than the tobacco industry.

Your attackers have successfully portrayed your core product, fossil fuel energy, as a self-destructive addiction that is destroying our planet, and your industry as

a fundamentally immoral industry. In a better world, the kind of world we should aspire to, they argue, the fossil fuel industry would not exist.

US President Barack Obama has described the oil industry as a “tyranny.” Allegedly “pro-oil” former president Bush coined the expression “America’s *addiction* to oil.” There is far more public hostility to the fossil fuel industry than to the tobacco industry. And it is accused of being far more damaging. As Keystone pipeline opposition leader Bill McKibben put it to widespread acclaim, the fossil fuel industry is “Public Enemy Number One to the survival of our planetary civilization.”

Your attackers have successfully portrayed your core product, fossil fuel energy, as a self-destructive addiction that is destroying our planet.

Why is the industry viewed as immoral? Because for decades, environmentalist leaders have made a *false but unanswered moral case against the fossil fuel industry*—by arguing successfully that it inherently destroys our planet and should be replaced with environmentally beneficial solar, wind, and biofuels.

According to this argument, it destroys our planet in two basic ways: by *increasing environmental dangers* (most notably through catastrophic global warming) and *depleting environmental resources* (through using fossil fuels and other resources at a rapid, “unsustainable” pace).

Like any immorality or addiction, the argument goes, we may not pay for it at the beginning but we will pay for it in the end. Thus, the only moral option is to use “clean, renewable energy” like solar, wind, and biofuels to live in harmony with the planet instead of exploiting and destroying it. And we need to do it as soon as is humanly possible.

THE FOSSIL FUEL INDUSTRY'S MORAL SURRENDER

There is only one way to defeat the environmentalists' moral case against fossil fuels—refute its central idea that fossil fuels destroy the planet. Because if we don't refute that idea, we accept it, and if we accept that fossil fuels are destroying the planet, the only logical conclusion is to cease new development and slow down existing development as much as possible.

Unfortunately, the fossil fuel industry has not refuted the moral case against fossil fuels. In fact, the vast majority of its communications *reinforce the moral case against fossil fuels*.

For example, take the common practice of publicly endorsing "renewables" as the ideal. Fossil fuel companies, particularly oil and gas companies, proudly feature windmills on webpages and annual reports, even though these are trivial to their bottom line and wildly uneconomic. This obviously implies that "renewables" are the goal—with oil and gas as just a temporarily necessary evil.

There is only one way to defeat the environmentalists' moral case against fossil fuels—refute its central idea that fossil fuels destroy the planet.

Don't think it's just the BPs, Shells, and Chevrons of the world who do this. Here's a concession of "renewables'" moral superiority by the most overtly pro-fossil-fuel trade organization I know of, the Western Energy Alliance (WEA):

Natural gas doesn't compete with renewable energy; in fact, it helps make the vision a reality. Greater electricity production from intermittent sources of power such as wind and solar is possible because natural gas electric generation is available to fill in during the large gaps of time when the wind isn't blowing and the sun isn't shining.

Translation: solar and wind are superior, "sustainable," "renewable" forms of energy—a "vision" we should make "a reality." And natural gas is justified, not as a great source of power that deserves to exist because it is great, but as a *necessary* means to a "renewable" future. It's clear that ideally we wouldn't want natural gas, but unfortunately we need it now.

Another way in which the fossil fuel industry reinforces the moral case against itself is by bragging that it is less destructive of the planet than it used to be.

For example, this last September, practically every oil and gas association enthusiastically printed news that the oil and gas industry "invested" between \$80 billion and \$160 billion in "GHG mitigation technologies" from 2000 to 2012, which contributed to a minor decline in US CO2 emissions during that period.

By endorsing greenhouse gas emissions as a fundamental benchmark of environmental health, the industry is conceding that it is causing catastrophic global warming—and that reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a moral imperative. But if you support that goal, you have to know that the "official" targets for emissions reductions are over 85% worldwide—which would mean the demolition of your industry. If greenhouse gas reductions are obligatory, then it is obligatory to get away from fossil fuels as soon as possible.

Still another way in which the fossil fuel industry reinforces the moral case against itself is by trying to sidestep the issue with talks of jobs or economics or patriotism. While these are important issues, it makes no sense to pursue them via fossil fuels if they are destroying our planet. Which is why environmentalists compellingly respond with arguments such as: Do we want economic growth tied to poison? Do we want more jobs where the workers are causing harm? Do we want our national

Unfortunately, the fossil fuel industry has not refuted the moral case against fossil fuels. In fact, the vast majority of its communications reinforce the moral case against fossil fuels.

identity to continue to be associated with something we now know is destructive?

There are many, many more forms of conceding the environmentalists' moral case and giving them the high ground. Here are half a dozen more just to give you a sense of the scope of the problem. (When I work with companies, one of the first objectives is to ferret out and eliminate all forms of conceding the moral case against fossil fuels.)

- Not mentioning the word “oil” on homepages (this has at times been true of ExxonMobil, Shell, and Chevron). This implies that you’re ashamed of what you do, and that your critics are right that oil is a self-destructive addiction.
- Focusing attention on everything but your core product—community service initiatives, charitable contributions, etc. This implies that you’re ashamed of your core product.
- Praising your attackers as “idealistic.” This implies that those who want your destruction are pursuing a legitimate ideal.
- Apologizing for your “environmental footprint.” This implies that there’s something wrong with the industrial development that is inherent in energy production.
- Spending most of your time on the defensive. This implies that you don’t have something positive to champion.

- Criticizing your opponents primarily for getting their facts wrong without refuting their basic moral argument. This implies that the argument is right, your opponents just need to identify your evils more precisely.

The industry’s position amounts to: “our product isn’t moral, but it’s something that we will need for some time as we transition to the ideal fossil-free future.” What you’re telling the world is that you are a *necessary evil*. And since the environmentalists also agree that it will take some time to transition to a fossil-free future, *the argument amounts to a debate over an expiration date*.

Environmentalists will argue that fossil fuels are necessary for a shorter time and you’ll argue that they’re necessary for a longer time, and they’ll always sound optimistic and idealistic and you’ll always sound cynical and pessimistic and self-serving.

So long as you concede that your product is a self-destructive addiction, you will not win hearts and minds—and you will not deserve to.

But your industry is not a necessary evil. It is a superior *good*. In the following sections I will explain the moral case for fossil fuels and the principles of communicating it to win hearts and minds.

THE MORAL CASE FOR THE FOSSIL FUEL INDUSTRY

What does it mean to be moral?

This is an involved philosophical question, but for our purposes I will say: an activity is moral if it is fundamentally beneficial to human life.

By that standard, is the fossil fuel industry moral? The answer to that question is a resounding yes. By producing the most abundant, affordable, reliable energy in the world, the fossil fuel industry makes every other industry more productive—and it makes every individual more productive and thus more prosperous, giving him a level of opportunity to pursue happiness that previous

generations couldn't even dream of. Energy, the fuel of technology, is *opportunity*—the opportunity to use technology to improve every aspect of life. *Including our environment.*

Any animal's environment can be broken down into two categories: threats and resources. (For human beings, "resources" includes a broad spectrum of things, including natural beauty.)

To assess the fossil fuel industry's impact on our environment, we simply need to ask: What is its impact on threats? What is its impact on resources?

The moral case against fossil fuels argues that the industry makes our environment more threatening and our resources more scarce.

The energy we get from fossil fuels is particularly valuable for protecting ourselves from the climate.

But if we look at the big-picture facts, the exact opposite is true. The fossil fuel industry makes our environment far safer and creates new resources out of once-useless raw materials.

Let's start with threats. Schoolchildren for the last several generations have been taught to think of our natural environment as a friendly, stable place—and our main environmental contribution is to mess it up and endanger ourselves in the process. Not so. Nature does not give us a healthy environment to live in—it gives us an environment full of organisms eager to kill us and natural forces that can easily overwhelm us.

It is only thanks to cheap, plentiful, reliable energy that we live in an environment where the air we breathe and the water we drink and the food we eat will not make us sick, and where we can cope with the often hostile climate of Mother Nature. Energy is what we need to build sturdy homes, to purify water, to produce huge amounts

of fresh food, to generate heat and air-conditioning, to irrigate deserts, to dry malaria-infested swamps, to build hospitals, and to manufacture pharmaceuticals, among many other things. And those of us who enjoy exploring the rest of nature should never forget that oil is what enables us to explore to our heart's content, which pre-industrial people didn't have the time, wealth, energy, or technology to do.

The energy we get from fossil fuels is particularly valuable for protecting ourselves from the climate. The climate is inherently dangerous (and it is always changing, whether we influence the change or not). Energy and technology have made us far safer from it.

The data here are unambiguous. In the last 80 years, as CO2 emissions have risen from an atmospheric concentration of .03% to .04%, climate-related deaths have declined 98%. Take drought-related deaths, which have declined by 99.98%. This has nothing to do with a friendly or unfriendly climate, it has to do with the oil and gas industry, which fuels high-energy agriculture as well as natural gas-produced fertilizer, and which fuels drought relief convoys.

Fossil fuels make the planet dramatically safer. And dramatically richer in resources.

Environmentalists treat "natural resources" as a fixed pile that nature gives us and which we dare not consume too quickly. In fact, nature gives us very little in the way of useful resources. From clean water to plentiful food to useful medicines, we need to *create them* using ingenuity.

This is certainly true of energy. Until the Industrial Revolution, there were almost no "energy resources" to speak of. Coal, oil, and natural gas aren't naturally resources—

Fossil fuels make the planet dramatically safer. And dramatically richer in resources.

they are naturally useless. (Or even nuisances.) Those who first discovered how to convert them into energy weren't depleting a resource, they were creating a resource. The world was a better place for it.

“Renewables” are no more the ideal form of energy than wood is the ideal material for skyscrapers.

It is obscene to call today's new resource creators in the shale energy industry and the oil sands energy industry “exploiters” when they have turned stone and sludge into life-giving energy—a feat that may ultimately extend to trillions of barrels of once inaccessible oil (in all of human history we've used just over a trillion barrels). The fact that oil is a “finite” material is not a problem, any more than the “finite” supply of rare-earth metals is a black mark against windmills. Every material is finite. Life is all about taking the theoretically finite but practically limitless materials in nature and creatively turning them into useful resources. The fossil fuel industry does it, the “renewable”—actually, the “unreliable”—energy industry doesn't. End of story. “Renewables” are no more the ideal form of energy than wood is the ideal material for skyscrapers.

And by creating the best form of energy resource, the fossil fuel industry helps every other industry more efficiently create every other type of resource, from food to steel.

Your industry is fundamentally good. It minimizes environmental threats and maximizes environmental resources. Understanding that—really understanding that, root and branch—is the key to winning hearts and minds.

REFRAMING THE DEBATE

Let's see how the moral case for fossil fuels applies to a real-life communications challenge. We'll take a tough one: Imagine a group of oil sands companies, blasted

for their use of “dirty” oil, their “environmental disturbance,” their “carbon footprint,” their “dangerous” pipelines, and their “toxic tailings ponds,” wants to win over the general public. The typical posture these companies take is “We're not quite as bad as you think” or “We believe in renewables, too”—confirming to everyone that they are fundamentally immoral.

But using the moral case for fossil fuels, all of these issues can be reframed. Here's what such a statement might look like:

Oil Sands Energy Technology: A Canadian Revolution

For almost two centuries, Canadians have known that there were incomprehensible amounts of energy stored underground in a material called bitumen—more energy than all the oil consumed in all of human history.

But that bitumen was useless because it was locked underground in an extremely inconvenient form—mixed together with sand, clay, and water to make “oil sands” that are as hard as a hockey puck. And there was no technology good enough to get that copious but elusive energy.

Now there is—it is the technology that we, the members of Canada's oil sands industry, are proud to have spent decades developing—and proud to spend every day taking to new heights.

Using a mixture of advanced mining, drilling, heating, and refining technologies, we can turn those oil sands into bitumen and that bitumen into oil, and that oil into trillions of gallons of the world's most important transportation fuels: gasoline for personal transportation, diesel for industrial machinery, and jet fuel for air travel. That oil is also the basis for thousands of miraculous synthetic products, from plastics to artificial hearts to pharmaceuticals to bulletproof vests.

To say we are excited about this technology revolution is an understatement. Energy is the industry that

powers every other industry: when there is more energy available in the world, it means everyone can be more productive and prosperous. And when there is more energy in the world, it means everyone can do more. The gallons of energy we produce go toward feeding a combine harvester that reaps the wheat for 500,000 loaves of bread a day; toward bringing plentiful food from areas with good harvests to areas with droughts; toward construction of a new hospital; toward bringing families together for the over two million North American weddings a year.

And while this energy revolution will be good for everyone, it is especially good for Canadians. It gives millions of us, whether we are in the oil industry or its hundreds of partner industries, the opportunities to do new, rewarding jobs—and to take on the many exciting challenges that any fast-growing industry faces.

For example, we need help overcoming shipping challenges. Every new product needs to be shipped, and ours is no different. We need help transporting our overflowing Canadian energy to other countries. We need help building new pipelines—the fastest, safest, and most cost-effective way of transporting liquids—to move our oil to the US and to our Western ports. We need help building new railways to take our oil to key cities that pipelines don't reach. And we need help driving new trucks to deliver our oil to exactly where consumers need it.

Transportation alone involves hundreds of integrated industries—and that's just one challenge we need to rise to.

Another important challenge is safety. Any time an industry produces a valuable new product, the materials in that product have to be mined and transported—and this involves safety challenges.

For example, the rare-earth metals that go into iPhones, electric cars, and wind turbines, are extremely high-toxicity on their own, and must be separated from far larger amounts of other high-toxicity materials to isolate them for industrial use.

Fortunately, the basic materials in oil sands—such as bitumen, which is made of ancient dead plants—are much less hazardous than those in most industrial

processes. Still, there are real hazards, and we take them very seriously.

For example, when we mine for oil sands and separate out the different components, residue called “tailings” remain—a phenomenon that is part of virtually every mining process. Since tailings can be harmful, we use state-of-the-art technology to make sure that human beings and even animals aren't exposed to them.

We face all of our industry's challenges, from the basic challenge of providing cheap, plentiful, reliable energy, to the challenge of protecting workers from hazardous materials, with the same core values: we are committed to advancing human life and human progress by producing affordable, reliable, versatile energy—with an inviolable respect for the rights of our neighbors, our employees, and all our fellow citizens.

And in that spirit, we feel it is important to address a major concern of many Canadians: our industry's contributions to carbon dioxide emissions.

While the claims of oil sands opponents that our oil emits significantly more CO₂ than other forms of oil have been proven empirically false, make no mistake: using oil fuels, and other fossil fuels (coal and natural gas) emits CO₂. And while fossil fuel opponents tend to exaggerate the scale of CO₂ emissions—in the last 150 years, CO₂ has gone from .03% of the atmosphere to .04%—when consumers use our products it does have some impact on the atmosphere and thus the climate system. Although the average temperature around the world has only increased by a historically unremarkable 1 degree Celsius over the past 150 years, CO₂ emissions likely contributed some of that (mild) warming.

Is this a significant problem—let alone the epic scale problem that would justify restricting peoples' ability to use cheap, plentiful, reliable energy?

We believe that while doomsday speculation says yes, the evidence says: no.

It is an empirical fact that the climate has become safer—in large part thanks to increased energy production. According to the EM-DAT (the authoritative International Disaster Database), overall climate-related deaths

are down 98% in the last 80 years. This is due to the proliferation of climate-protection technology (climate control, sturdy homes, weather satellites, drought relief convoys, modern agriculture), which are made possible by fossil fuels, especially oil.

We cannot have a meaningful discussion about climate if we ignore the importance of portable energy in building sturdy, heated-and-air-conditioned homes or in powering an agricultural system that has reduced drought-related deaths by 99.98% in the last 80 years.

More broadly, high-energy, highly-developed countries have the most livable environments, because they have the means to protect themselves from the many dangers of nature. Low-energy, undeveloped countries have the worst environments and are the most vulnerable to disasters, whether natural or manmade.

Anyone who cares about our environment and our climate must recognize that cheap, plentiful, reliable energy is a nonnegotiable essential.

Unfortunately, environmental groups who oppose oil sands have not demonstrated a concern for the availability of cheap, plentiful, reliable energy. We live in a world that desperately needs energy growth. Over a billion people lack any electricity—not coincidentally, they live in the most dangerous environments. For everyone in the world to have the same amount of energy as the average German we would need a doubling of energy production.

Over 80% of the energy that the citizens of the world use to survive and flourish comes from fossil fuels—

Anyone who cares about our environment and our climate must recognize that cheap, plentiful, reliable energy is a nonnegotiable essential.

because that is the cheapest, most plentiful, most reliable source ever developed. Many environmental groups say at least 80% of it should be illegal. Most of the rest of our energy comes from non-carbon nuclear and hydroelectric—which most of these same environmental groups fight to outlaw. They claim to support solar and wind technology, which, after 50 years of subsidies, produce less than 1% of the world's energy—and, because the sun and wind provide only intermittent energy, require fossil fuel backups.

We will not regard such groups as legitimate participants in a constructive discussion about energy—until they acknowledge the irreplaceable value of cheap, plentiful, reliable energy for our economy and our environment.

Fortunately, most Canadians, including many who consider themselves environmentalists, are interested—not in blind, anti-development hostility and hysteria—but in learning about the technologies that will move our nation and our world forward. We believe that oil sands technology is the technology of the future—our future. We believe that this is Canada's Decade of Opportunity. Let's seize it.

VALUES-BASED COMMUNICATION

Do you agree that the above statement is more likely to win hearts and minds than what you would typically see from oil companies? If so, note that in this statement I was able to reframe every issue to take the moral high ground. And I'm only able to do this because I know the moral case thoroughly.

When CIP teaches communications to companies, we teach first and foremost that effective communication begins with a deep understanding of your own case.

After understanding, the second most important aspect to communicating the moral case for fossil

When CIP teaches communications to companies, we teach first and foremost that effective communication begins with a deep understanding of your own case.

fuels is values-based communication. Values-based communication is communication that vividly connects your audience's values to the conclusion you want them to reach and the action you want them to take.

Here are six of the principles of values-based communication that we apply—and teach.

1. Challenge/triumph storytelling: What kind of activities and industries do we value? Ones that pursue a noble, difficult goal and overcome challenges to achieve it. To the extent that we regard an industry's activity (such as producing electricity cheaply) as easy or immoral, we will not value it. Thus, CIP continuously frames issues in terms of challenges and triumphs—economic, technological, environmental. Life gives us a challenge—such as the need for high-caliber energy—and industrialists use ingenuity and effort to triumph over that challenge and improve human life and the human environment.
2. Emphasize their need and your achievement: Always explain the fundamental human need that your industry/product meets. For example, the coal industry globally is the best in the world at meeting our need for the electricity that purifies our water, manufactures our appliances, cools our homes, and keeps the Internet on.
3. Technologize your industry: Always stress that you are a technology industry—you use human ingenuity to solve problems and meet fundamental human needs. The word “technology” rightly has many

positive moral associations in the minds of the public and you have every right to capitalize on this. For example, natural gas and coal technologies are the leading electricity technologies in the world, they are ever-evolving, and the industry should make that very clear.

4. Personalize the value you create: Always make clear how your product impacts the lives of specific individuals. Only then do big-picture numbers resonate; otherwise they are empty. Here's an example I've used for the oil industry: “This past year, the oil industry helped take 4 million newlyweds to their dream destinations for their honeymoons. It helped bring 300 million Americans to their favorite places: yoga studios, soccer games, friends' houses. It made possible the bulletproof vests that protect 500,000 policemen a year and the fire-resistant jackets that protect 1,000,000 firefighters a year.”
5. Humanize your people: Always make clear that your industry is made up of admirable individuals who are proud of their jobs because those jobs are doing something morally good—using technology to produce the fuel of civilization. Do not try to humanize your producers by giving non-fossil fuel justifications for their jobs—such as their charitable work, planting trees, etc. That concedes that their real job is immoral and needs an outside justification. You don't hear solar employees trying to justify themselves by the trees they plant (even though they cut down a heck of a lot of trees!).
6. Normalize your hazards: Always acknowledge that every human activity has hazards, and do not shy away from yours. Instead, stress that though every technology faces safety/health challenges, your industry is one of the best at overcoming them. It's important to stress that no industry is exempt from such challenges. For example, point out the immense mining hazards involved in aggregating the materials for manufacturing solar panels and the significant waste disposal hazards involved. Hazards are normal. The question is, who can minimize them while maximizing benefits? Remind people that the biggest hazard of all is a lack of affordable, reliable energy—because that means a lack of all the benefits it provides.

WHAT IS POSSIBLE

In my experience, whatever the audience and whatever the medium, to base communications on the moral case for the fossil fuel industry is a game-changer.

I divide winning hearts and minds into three categories: neutralizing attackers, turning non-supporters into supporters, and turning supporters into champions. Here are some examples of how this works in practice.

An example of neutralizing attackers is a presentation I gave at Vassar College on “Fossil Fuels Improve the Planet” (my book). Here’s a description of the event from the host:

Before Alex Epstein’s lecture, no other students on my campus could imagine an environmental or moral defense of the fossil fuel industry. Now, weeks later, I am amazed at how they now defend the industry. The moderates tell me that the decision to invite Epstein was the best thing we could have done. The Greens affiliated with 350.org who walked out on Epstein’s lecture faced an immediate campus backlash bigger than I had ever seen. We thought these environmentalists were undefeatable for the past three years, but now, two weeks later, I can say that they are no longer a powerful force on campus.

—Julian Hassan, student, Vassar College

An example of turning a non-supporter into a supporter is this “left-leaning attorney” who was (mis)educated to be anti-oil but learned the other side of the story from CIP:

Last week I attended an informational meeting about my office’s 401(k) investment options for employees’ portfolios. There was a “Socially Responsible” option for those who do not want their funds invested in, among other things, oil. Knowing Alex’s arguments on the life-giving properties of oil, imagine how my blood started boiling at the insinuation that it is somehow irresponsible to invest in oil. As a left-leaning attorney in Washington, D.C., I hear people demonize fossil fuels all the time, but

CIP has shown me that investing in oil is one of the more socially responsible things I could do.

—Attorney, Washington, DC

An example of turning a supporter into a champion, which CIP has become well-known for through our “I Love Fossil Fuels Campaign,” is this member:

I have been involved in the general debate of the benefits of the oil/gas industry for several years now. I have also been asked to serve on televised debates, give Op-Ed statements, and have written extensively on the subject of oil/gas and it’s benefits to mankind. I have always found that during these engagements, that I have always been put on the defensive, and let the opposition set the tone of the discussion. While I feel that up until now, I have held my own, I have also felt that I wasn’t communicating my point as effectively as I would have liked to, always being put in a defensive position. You have, by example, shown me a way to make my points in a manner that not only lets me express fully my position, but to show the industry in a truly positive light. . . . I want to thank you, and your staff for the hard work and dedication to this cause, and to tell you that you have all made a big difference in the way people discuss and look at our industry.

—Terry Cunningham, EPI Associates

In my experience, whatever the audience and whatever the medium, to base communications on the moral case for the fossil fuel industry is a game-changer.

There is no reason why the fossil fuel industry can’t be ten times more effective at neutralizing attackers, turning non-supporters into supporters, and turning

supporters into champions. These ideas are not only logical in theory; they also work in practice.

Based on my experience, I believe that if enough of us work together applying these ideas, the unimaginable is possible. In the future, I see:

- Pro-fossil fuel politicians winning spectacular victories over anti-fossil fuel politicians in debates.
- Energy companies having inspiring, iconic campaigns that make them as cool as iPhones.
- Workforces full of incredibly educated, motivated, articulate ambassadors.
- Associations training members in values-based communication.
- News stories with quotes by morally confident, persuasive CEOs.
- Websites having more emotional resonance than the Greenpeace or Sierra Club websites.
- Anyone who delays a pipeline for five years is widely criticized, not as pro-environment, but as anti-progress.
- A new generation of intellectuals who are passionate advocates of fossil fuels.
- College campuses where students are not afraid to say “I Love Fossil Fuels.”

TURNING POSSIBILITY INTO REALITY

This year, your industry will lose billions of dollars because it has failed to win hearts and minds. The communications materials of the vast, vast majority of companies are not only failing to win hearts and minds, but they are also empowering the opposition by conceding their ideas. And it is completely unnecessary. There is a fundamentally different approach that makes sense and actually works.

If you agree with me, the implications are dramatic: Every fossil fuel company’s internal and external communications, for every medium and every audience, needs to incorporate the moral case for fossil fuels and values-based communication. This includes finding and eliminating all instances of conceding that you are a “necessary evil” and, even more importantly, creating content that truly connects with and inspires your audiences.

*This year, your industry will
lose billions of dollars
because it has failed to win
hearts and minds.*

The challenge here is that these cannot be learned or applied overnight—they are bodies of knowledge that take study and practice. So how can we apply them as soon as possible and as widely as possible?

In my experience, it is a combination of collaboration and education. At CIP we work with companies and associations on transforming their highest-leverage projects to truly win hearts and minds. We also train the highest-leverage communicators, giving them the mastery that can only come with intensive feedback. Just as important, though, we offer standalone educational resources that every CEO, communications professional, employee, or citizen can use to educate themselves in the moral case for fossil fuels and values-based communication. Right now, you have the ability to get, for free, at <http://industrialprogress.com>, hundreds of pages of books and articles, and dozens of hours of audio. And right now, you have the ability to contact me directly to discuss how you or your company can win hearts and minds.

Email me at alex@alexepstein.com to let me know you’re interested in making this a reality.



**CENTER for
INDUSTRIAL
PROGRESS**