

RE: Burning is the issue

Dear Editor,

John Cummings (Letters, 11/19/2016) is right about one thing- fossil fuels are currently an important component of our modern lives- as were horses and sperm whale oil in their day. But he misconstrues the arguments of those "kids" against the use of "fossil fuels" when he fails to distinguish between "fossil fuels" and "fossil hydrocarbons". Those "kids" are only against fossil hydrocarbons when they are burned as fuel and their CO2 pollution is released to our atmosphere, with the devastating consequences we are already seeing in droughts and floods, not mention rising temperatures and sea levels.

Using fossil hydrocarbons to produce plastics, lubricants, chemicals and other products is not an issue, since these items are commonly reused or recycled. If they were burned, then they too would be an issue, but recycling of motor oil, plastics and chemicals is already occurring. Let's face the facts: scientific experts in every country agree that burning fossil fuels is destroying our children's and grandchildren's future, and there is no doubt that sooner or later we (or they) are going to run out of fossil fuels to burn anyway, so the sooner we get off this addiction, the better.

Or we can be like one commentator I saw on the Internet who said, and I quote: "I don't care if everyone on the planet dies 100 years from now, I want dollar a gallon gas now". Now I ask you all: is this really what we've come to?

John Donovan  
Eugene, 97405