



No-NetZero...

Awareness is growing ... Climate change is mostly natural, it's not an emergency, and it's not much to do with us.

We don't need to follow the disaster of NetZero. The only action needed is very manageable localized adaption, and this can only be accomplished with the continued and expanded use of fossil fuels.

CO2 is not a pollutant, and is not a significant driver of climate change, so any mitigation such as NetZero is unnecessary, technologically unattainable, economically unviable and extremely foolish.

But we still get propaganda and nonsense from the climate scare hoax even if it does not have scientific data to support the position. This is because they keep confusing natural weather transients with climate change.

When the IPCC scientific reports are separated from the UN political rhetoric its clear we do not have an emergency, but too many people want to keep the nose in the funding bucket!

The good news is that many people are waking up to the reality of this climate emergency scam.

We need to dismantle the climate emergency industrial complex and redeploy efforts to other much more useful initiatives.

Wind and solar is not a reliable solution for the main energy grid although it does have some off grid applications, and certainly wont support industrial activity.

Also, everyone must realize that fossil fuels are needed for many other requirements outside of just electrical energy and without it we will have an economy more like the 1900s.

Further the emerging economies are forging ahead without the nonsense our western policies are creating so they will get stronger while we in the west get weaker due to our rank stupidity.

Its normal for local organizations undertaking local adaption to weather conditions and any slight changes in climate. This is an ongoing and valid and very affordable activity compared with CO2 mitigation which is termed NetZero that is unnecessary, technologically unattainable, economically unviable and extremely foolish.

What we are facing is the climate emergency rhetoric that has funded the growth of a climate emergency industrial complex enjoying vast amounts of funding which is breeding an almost religious fanaticism at all levels and has subjugated the scientific community and prevented a balanced scientific viewpoint on the issue from academia and organizations where any dissension against the religion is career limiting etc.. This is covered very well in both documentaries linked here.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k3Ut3cjENZg>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRfQzMgvfDA>

Also, this material explains that although there are variations in weather patterns that create small amounts of changes to flood plains and rainfall levels these are normal and not unusual when considered over an average and statistical timeframe and experts have declared based on this logic that to date no severe trends can be attributed to any climate change. (see IPCC reports)

A good source is the book "Unsettled" by Koonin and he quotes directly from the IPCC and various meteorological authorities.

Remember weather happens every year and climate is a 30-year summary.

The big bottom line .. the impact of climate change and CO2 increase is NOT evident as a negative in the ecological data such as for floods fires tornados sea level rise sea ice etc. the only thing it has done is improved the greening of the planet and improved our food supply and growing seasons. Weather extremes have always been with us and creating a panic by picking a short range of data is foolish, and this is what the media likes to do to push up the panic to sell product. This is well covered in the documentaries above.

Pick any impact subject and let's review real data and a good source of this is here.

[Climate Quiz - CO2 Coalition](#)

<https://co2coalition.org/climate-quiz/>

All the data is from official organizations including the IPCC but without the panic political spin.

Predictions using climate models are just that... and are way off and keep getting proved wrong. One big reason is they refuse to consider anything other than CO2 and many scientists urge them to include the sun and other external galactic forces into these models. But they are only focused on proving climate is human induced not building a realistic model.

Many articles say..... Carbon dioxide is responsible for the total warming of Earth's climate due to human-produced greenhouse gases. Small increases in its concentration have major effects. This is highly disputed...As many scientists show that CO2 only works over a limited bandwidth and is saturated and adding more will have little effect.

For a better understanding of why CO2 gets too much attention refer to this link and go to 24 minutes in on the video for the point I am making.

<https://ca.video.search.yahoo.com/search/video?fr=yfp-t-s&ei=UTF-8&p=happer+on+climate+change#id=1&vid=efac5af9d8a75e6822ec7fe5188e64de&action=click>

Many articles are based on the premise that CO2 drives temperature but historical proxy measurements of temperature versus CO2 shows CO2 ALWAYS lagging temperature. So gives a strong argument that although we have added CO2 its something else driving temperature.... Maybe the sun?.. but don't tell the IPCC

Also, there is now some discussion about debunking the theory of the currently accepted theory of the green-house-effect using thermodynamic equilibrium theory, and if true it explains why the climate models that only use CO2 to predict temperature keep getting it wrong.

Its now being suggested that any energy that is trapped by CO2 in its bandwidth will be redeployed and transmitted at other wavelengths. Also, that the theory of a positive feedback effect that can amplify increases in CO2 is wrong and does not follow the theory of thermodynamics.

Bottom line.. we need a deeper scientific review before any scientific law can be accepted associated with the CO2 and temperature relationship.

They need to stop building hypothesis to justify the need for NetZero and seek the truth.

In general, a warmer planet is a better option than a colder planet and history shows we thrived when it was warmer than now and suffered when colder.

Also, in earth's history we are at a low temperature and low CO2 point, and more is better than less for many reasons.

So, its clear based on the past trends showing no issues and the uncertainty of the predictions and the adverse effects on our prosperity by following NetZero that we should halt that journey and not overreact.

Summary

Climate change is mostly natural, it's not an emergency, and it's not much to do with us.

Stop the mitigation of CO2 and only adapt to any weather or climate change using the power of fossil fuels.

More data to support the scientific argument at ...

<https://www.brainzmagazine.com/post/take-back-manufacturing-climate-realism>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k3Ut3cjENZg>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRfQzMgvfDA>

Prosperity Issues...

Our western democracy is suffering from low prosperity and our biggest threat to future prosperity is our approach to climate change.

The motivation for western governments moving away from the ongoing economic security of fossil fuels has been driven by fear of the impact of the release of CO2 into the atmosphere creating a dangerous climate emergency. This has been the position of the UN's IPCC, and this has become the "settled science" by the environmental movement, the media, and all the western governments, with significant policies moving vast amounts of our wealth toward a goal of NetZero.

We continue to get political propaganda from the UN and others that the climate change is a clear and present danger, and an emergency that needs immediate and drastic action. But the scientific reports published by the UN based IPCC and some other scientific institutions tell a far different story of no significant change so far in environmental or ecological impact on human civilization from climate change. And the IPCC are using climate models that consistently have great difficulty in predicting the impact or cause of a warming planet into the future.

The media who like to sell sensationalism use any level of extreme weather to argue that a climate emergency exists when the weather extremes are in most cases natural and not statistically different than past historical records, and in some cases are less extreme than in the past.

This climate emergency rhetoric has funded the growth of a climate emergency industrial complex which has breed an almost religious fanaticism at all levels that has subjugated the scientific community and prevented a balanced scientific viewpoint on the issue.

But now many scientists are creating an awareness that Climate change is mostly natural, it's not an emergency, and it's not us.

They dispute this “climate emergency” position and argue that CO2 is not a pollutant, and is not a significant driver of climate change, so any mitigation such as NetZero is unnecessary, technologically unattainable, economically unviable and extremely foolish.

They show proof that Climate Warming is having no negative effects and that the increase in CO2 is greening the planet and improving food supplies and that we need to stop the panic before we damage our future. They declare that the only near-term action needed is very manageable localized adaption, and this can only be accomplished with the continued and expanded use of fossil fuels.


Also, many economists are concerned about NetZero’s significantly negative effect on both national and global prosperity.

Energy experts explain that Wind and Solar is not a reliable solution for the main energy grid although it does have some off grid applications, and certainly wont support industrial activity. All agree that nuclear power is a far better solution, but that fossil fuels are needed for many other requirements outside of just electrical energy, and without it we will have an economy more like the 1900s.

The NetZero journey will make it impossible to undertake policies to reshore and localize our over-extended supply chains and support the ailing industrial and resource sectors so we can avoid the growing geo-political risks and recapitalize on the opportunity to have a far more balanced economy of resources, manufacturing, and services, and so better support national prosperity for all their citizens.

Its clear that the western nations will not be the prime future generators of CO2 as the emerging economies are forging ahead without the economic constraints of NetZero, so they will get stronger, while we in the west get weaker.

So, Much MORE debate MUST be undertaken so that our future energy policies and technologies are much better balanced between any environmental risk and the need for the recovery of our prosperity.



More about my TBM book at

www.nigelsouthwayauthor.com

Climate hoax?

Many organizations such as Clintel continue to provide climate reality information that will ensure that the subjugated climate science gets reported correctly as we engineer a better communication pathway to our political decision makers so that we can far better support our future national industrial capability and prosperity.

We must avoid the trap of non- scientific religious entrapment generated by the so-called climate consensus now under reset by our new scientific organizations.

Expect more of the truth on climate change to be exposed as we pursue reality in our national politics.

This is an extract from a newspaper in Canada (National Post... Conrad Black 27 Apr 2024)

A brief filed with the court of appeals in The Hague in November by three eminent, American climate-related academics, Richard Lindzen of MIT, William Happer of Princeton, and Steven Koonin of New York University, the Hoover Institute, and former climate adviser to President Obama, challenged the finding of a lower court and held that scientific analysis, as opposed to an aggregation of “government opinion, consensus, peer review, and cherry-picked or falsified data,” shows that “Fossil fuels and CO₂ will NOT cause dangerous climate change, there will be disastrous consequences for people worldwide if fossil fuels in CO₂ emissions are reduced to net zero, including mass starvation.” They assert that the poor, future generations, and the entire West will suffer profoundly from any such policy. which “will undermine human rights and cripple the realization of the first three UN sustainable development goals — no poverty, zero hunger, and good health and well-being.”

The three experts warn against equating “the state of climate science with the reports of the Inter governmental Panel on Climate Change,” which “have no value as science, because the IPCC is government-controlled and represents only government opinions, not science.” It also denounced the lower court verdict that “dangerous climate change and extreme weather are caused by CO₂ emissions from fossil fuels ... We demonstrate that these conclusions are contradicted by the scientific method, and only supported by the unscientific methods mentioned. Hundreds of research papers confirm the highly beneficial effects of the increased concentration of atmospheric CO₂, especially in dry farming areas.”

They go on to represent the CO₂ as essential to food, and thus to life on earth, and that the more there is of CO₂, the more food there will be, especially in drought-stricken areas. They also make the case that greenhouse gases prevent us from freezing to

death, that there are “enormous social benefits to fossil fuels and that net zero will expand human starvation by eliminating nitrogen fertilizer.”

This highly recondite and meticulously documented paper states that “600 million years of carbon dioxide in temperature data contradict the theory of catastrophic global warming being caused by high levels of CO₂, and that the atmospheric CO₂ is now heavily saturated, which means that more will have little warming effect.”

Up until recently, the zealots pretended that such opinions are held only by the uninformed, or the paid lobbyists of the oil industry, but they are not going to be able to get away with this much longer.

The ranks of the critics are swelling every week with aggrieved members of the voting public distressed by completely unnecessary skyrocketing costs generated by the fearmongering climate zealots.

With any luck, the tide of logical evidence will wash away the climate lunatics of this country before the damage becomes irreparable.

The response paper submitted to the court... PDF Render | Friends of Science
<https://friendsofscience.org/pdf-render.html?page=295>

Climate Reality Predicted.

It's clear that many western governments are now experiencing a political shift in thinking on the reality and risks of following a NetZero policy, and we predict new political resolutions on the approach to climate change in the new year and beyond.

The past Climate Emergency rhetoric

Until recently western nations had been compliant toward the UN IPCC driven agenda that has aggressively communicated that we have a global climate emergency that requires these national governments sign on to an immediate NetZero approach directing the elimination of fossil fuels as rapidly as possible to avoid an existential threat to our civilization.

The Focus is on the west.

The NetZero mandate is mainly focused on the western nations while the “rest” can proceed unhindered in using fossil fuels to build their economies and are free to maximise their global trade activities at the expense to western economic sovereignty.

The western nations have in the last 30 years seen their prosperity flatlined or worse due to the foolish adoption of the other UN controlled initiative of global free trade that is managed by the World trade organization and its multilateral mandates and rules.

So, NetZero has become a huge distraction from the extremely necessary reshoring and recovery of the western industrial base to reinstall more balanced economies and achieve a reversal of the declining productivity and prosperity in these western nations.

Climate “reality” is kicking in.

Its clear that many western governments are now experiencing a political shift in thinking on the reality and risks of following a NetZero policy, and we predict new political resolutions on the approach to climate change in the new year and beyond.

Most western nations are or will be soon moving through changes in government/s that are predicted to be much more nationalistic, with an ideology more focused on the need to maintain or improve national prosperity, rather than support multilateral initiatives such as NetZero.

These new governments will be grappling with the huge risk to national prosperity of displacing or eliminating fossil fuels that have been the main reason for their advance in human flourishing in the last 150 years.

They have come to understand the trillions in mainly citizen wealth already wasted on the NetZero journey with very limited progress in reducing global reliance on fossil fuels with the associated price increases and reduced energy reliability making any further expenditure non-viable.

Many western citizens are faced with legislated changes to life altering choices in fuels to heat the home and transportation via the mandate to move to EVs, with many consumers and providers doubting that this transition can be achieved without significant pain and prosperity loss.

Many now believe that NetZero is being undertaken without any full risk assessment and is forcing economies to undertake the replacement or modification of fossil fuels with alternative technologies and solutions that are either unavailable, not ready, scientifically un-capable, or will further increase imports and move them even further from a balanced economy.

Many experts have made it clear that due to the massive national investments required NetZero will further reduce prosperity and increase social disruption and citizen suffering.

Many of these economies may have to face the reality that fossil fuels will continue to be the only viable source of sustainability and prosperity for many decades to come.

The citizens in these western nations may be deciding that NetZero is foolish, unfair, hi-risk, and just plain unrealistic in the real world.

Lack of scientific closure

In parallel with this fresh political awakening about the stark reality about implementing NetZero there is also growing Scientific expert opinion that argues against the premise that we have a climate emergency and questions the need for a move toward NetZero.

These experts have formed scientific organizations such as CLINTEL <https://clintel.org> and the CO2 Coalition <https://co2coalition.org> that have collected signatures from an impressive list of climate experts that maintain that the NetZero mandate has been over-driven by political propaganda rather than scientific rigor and due diligence. They provide facts to insist that the UN-IPCC <https://www.ipcc.ch> has created a false and dangerous consensus that has generated unnecessary public wide alarmism and fanaticism that is polarizing our institutions and radicalizing our youth.

Many of these scientists explain that the normal and essential scientific dialogue has been heavily suppressed and subjugated by political pressures to avoid any change to the IPCC driven NetZero groupthink, and this has made scientific peer review, risk management, and alternative policy review almost impossible.

National governments must take back control.

Based on the above it's now time for western national governments to form their own scientific commissions and follow a common-sense approach to policy setting on matters of the changing climate. This must involve fully reevaluating the existing UN initiatives that have clearly lost any form of reality or responsibility. It also brings into question the real motives of these apparently unrealistic multilateral agendas.

These national government commissions must review and gather input from scientists on all sides of the discussion so that they reach a far better risk assessment and policy level action plans to balance climate change risk with much needed national prosperity and the well being of their national citizens.

These national commissions must operate with zero interference from the UN IPCC as its clear that agenda is fixed and entrenched and has become far more political than scientific, with more emphasis on multilateral virtuousness rather than reality.

Past policies and commitments for NetZero must be placed on hold until this review process is completed.

The climate facts and discussion needed.....

Its very clear that the climate change discussion should focus on the following "questions and answers".

Is the climate changing?

YES.... No dispute by all concerned.

Is the climate change an emergency, whatever the root cause?

The UN-IPCC says YES!

But many scientists organized into separate bodies and groups say... NO!
These scientists have facts that support that most of the impact of the climate change so far is positive for humankind with the warming planet not generating any significant statistical change in weather patterns or ecological issues with the added benefit of extending growing cycles and the higher levels of CO2 generating a greener planet with far better food supply.

This correlates with historical knowledge that past civilizations thrived in times of increased temperatures and struggled when the climate was cold.

Although many dire predictions of climate doom have been made over the years, they have all been proved false.

There are now many books, articles and documentaries that underpin that we don't have a climate emergency and a recent documentary [A Climate Conversation](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRfQzMgvfDA) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRfQzMgvfDA> declares the fallacy of climate panic and the impracticality of NetZero.

Is the climate change (most of it) caused by humans? ...

The UN-IPCC says YES.

But many scientists organized into separate bodies and groups say NO!

They explain that although humans have historically been a source of planet pollution to air, sea, rivers, plants and animal life, we have recently improved significantly in this regard.

The main argument by the UN for our contribution to climate change is the release of additional CO2 into the atmosphere by the burning of oil, gas that releases CO2 into the atmosphere.

There is no dispute we have liberated CO2 that was trapped in buried fossils and have added it to the atmosphere, but some scientists question if our contribution is significant to the CO2 in progress in the atmosphere as there are many other sources of CO2 on the planet. Some scientists have declared that our

contribution to the increase in CO2 level is less than 20% with almost 80% of the rise in CO2 being natural.

Is increasing CO2 the main cause of the climate change?

The UN-IPCC says YES.

But many scientists organized into separate groups say... NO!

They argue that the UN-IPCC science uses inaccurate computer models to explain how CO2, which is an atmospheric trace gas, can affect the planet temperature. They dispute that there is a significant causation between increasing CO2 and slightly increasing planet temperature.

These scientists explain that CO2 is a poor greenhouse gas with limited ability to effect temperature. They provide calculations that explain that a doubling of CO2 can only add 1% to planet temperature. The argument that an increase in CO2 generates a "turbo effect" on water vapor which could be a far stronger contributor to temperature has not been validated by all scientists and remains only a theory. The countervailing theory is that the laws of thermodynamic equilibrium will balance out any possible "turbo effect". Scientific discussions on this subject are still a work in progress.

Further, many maintain that the NetZero action on the mitigation of CO2 emissions is unnecessary as the planet warming is part of a natural cycle, and even with increasing CO2 over the last few decades current data on environmental changes of extreme weather events and sea level rise show very minimal threat to humankind of any increase in global temperatures, and a far better policy would be localized adaptation (if needed) that will definitely need to be undertaken with the power of fossil fuels.

In fact, the so-called threat of increasing CO2 is being deemed by some scientists as a net benefit and not a threat, as it is increasing the food supply across the biosphere of our planet.

Can NetZero be undertaken in the time frames set by the UN, and is it viable?

The industrial expert's say absolutely not.

The investment to undertake this NetZero journey is far more than the ability for any of the national governments to adequately fund.

So called renewable technologies will nor support a modern industrial economy that requires reliable power 24/7

The migration to EVs that is being mandated in many western nations will increase the cost of transportation by at least 50% once the gas tax which

supports the existing transport infrastructure is transferred to the electrical energy that EVs will consume. Also, the massive new infrastructure to support EV recharging is yet to be planned or budgeted.

Replacing heavy ground transportation and aircraft propulsion and trade shipping with non-fossil-fuel solutions will be a very long process and will probably be cost prohibitive.

The raw materials and global supply chains to support the Renewables and EV products will be a massive undertaking at an order of magnitude more than any mineral extraction effort already undertaken by mankind to date. It proves to be an expensive and dirty affair that is already exploiting immature economies and its citizens in unsafe practices. Also, it will only be viable and practical with the extended use of fossil fuel driven equipment. Go figure!

Also, we have not undertaken enough commitment to nuclear power and hydro power, which are the best solutions for the generation of clean electricity.

Although we may be able to reduce the burning of fossil fuels to power our transportation and heat our facilities, we will always need fossil fuel materials to “make things”. The byproducts of fossil fuels are essential for our modern lifestyle, such as transportation equipment, industrial equipment, pharmaceuticals, computers, buildings, furnishings, clothes, shoes, etc, etc.

A world without fossil-fuels and the associated by products will put us back into the mid 19th century and will mean cutting down many trees for fuel, and the hunting and killing of animals for skins and other materials and will mean hardship for many. Contemplating a world without such materials is far from realistic or viable!

Does the scientific community believe that there has been the political subjugation of science.

Many climate scientists explain in recent articles that the scientific community and most research institutions have been politically subjugated by the climate emergency groupthink, with clear evidence of threats of funding withdraw, career termination, and professional intimidation, unless they comply with the misappropriation of science to generate a false consensus that we have a climate emergency. So, its clear that such a situation has also made any normal scientific peer review process and traditional scientific journal publishing meaningless.

Although true peer review process has been subjugated, many articles and books have been authored by these climate scientists that supports the climate reality position presented here.

This escalating scientific discord demands a strong need for far more open dialogue on climate change and for a detailed review and probable change in national policies.

We don't need Climate panic or alarmism or climate denial or skepticism or attacks on our existing energy providers ... we need to strive for scientific truth and policies that can achieve..... Climate Realism.

The nation-based policies.

Each western nation must develop its own commission and review process to set policies for managing climate change and we are very certain most national political leaders, after a solid review with all scientists and industrialists once they are free to declare the truth, will more realistically rate the risks and set priorities to undertake its own approach to climate change more in keeping with its own economics and prosperity goals.

Let's hope we will soon see a return to common sense feet on the ground national politics that will focus much more on national prosperity.

Future policies must focus on a more balanced economy by creating an industrial policy that encourages significant reshoring of the manufacturing base. This must include much stricter enforcement of local trade blocs such as the USMCA to reduce the need for unnecessary imports to balance trade to increase local productivity and avoid future geopolitical risks.

A positive outcome of this localized trade policy will be the reduction in the pollution of the oceans by global shipping and the reduction of globalized manufacturing in ill-prepared emerging economies which has become one of the largest pollution mechanisms on the planet in the last 30 years.

The western governments must focus on rebuilding infrastructure to support re-industrialization including achieving local energy independence using affordable solutions such as natural gas and nuclear power. This must be a firm goal to fuel the growth in industrial capacity. But this solution must never again be constrained by any Net-Zero climate policies.

Wasteful government activities and regulations must be reduced, but they must provide adequate support systems such as national health, education, and housing systems to benefit citizens as they participate in the recovery of their economic prosperity.

National borders and out-of-control immigration and migration must be far better managed.

National priorities must move away from the distraction of the past over-indulgence in multilateral initiatives, including the dangerous global initiatives of DEI / SDG / ESG as they are clearly not serving the interests of the western citizens.

So, the top priority of these western governments is to make citizen prosperity and economic affordability a top priority.

Possible outcomes

The suggested review process must allow all scientists to work together in a much more open and fear free manner to provide a much more science based and balanced resolution on the impact of mankind on the climate.

Its clear that future climate change policies will feature far shorter term and more localized adaption to any climate change than the cost prohibitive globalized mitigation approach suggested by NetZero.

Also, these climate policies must be undertaken on a far more extended time frame with decision stage gates such that demonstrated capability of technology and industrial capacity is achieved prior to any policy implementation. All such progress and changes must be based on commercial viability and better balanced with prosperity for the nation, and not driven by narcissistic leadership and ideological fantasy.

It is anticipated that the western nations will generate these national resolutions to balance climate and prosperity policies in collaboration with their regional trade bloc partners such as the EU and the USMCA.

The UN and the IPCC must become more of a multilateral coordinating and monitoring group rather than a controlling body, and in this manner, we will avoid the multilateral-group-think that has generated unrealistic goals of forced policies and under-managed risks and the inevitable politicization of science.

Of course, in the much longer term some multilateral activity may be appropriate to share solutions to any changes in climate, but national governments must always be in control of their economies, and their national interests, and ensure the best interest of their citizens are always served.

The correct idiom for the future of mankind will be ***“keep calm and carry on!”***

.....