

22/03/24

# THE LUNACY OF NET ZERO AND THE UK'S POLITICAL PARTIES POLICIES

## SUMMARY

This note aims to expose the fallacy of net zero and how the current main UK political parties are all promoting the myth. It will examine how certain factors have contributed to this situation by comparing the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on global temperature and the UK's contribution. In all the hype of human activities supposedly increasing global temperatures and the claimed deleterious effect on the earth's climate, the actual effect of achieving net zero on the earth's temperature is rarely mentioned, because it is insignificant.

This statement can be seen to be supported by two graphs of the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on global temperatures which are presented and discussed. These graphs produced by the IPCC and eminent professors Dr William Happer, of Princeton University and Dr van Wijngaarden, of York University, Canada, are referred to as (H&vW) and IPCC in the discussion that follows.

The H&vW graph indicates that the current solution to the so-called global warming to *reduce* global human CO<sub>2</sub> to pre-industrial emissions by all the countries in the world may *only* reduce the global temperature increase by:

**0.0036 of 1°C or 3,600 ppm of 1°C**

So the UK should only reduce the global temperature after reducing its CO<sub>2</sub> output to pre-industrial levels by a derisory:

**0.000036 of 1°C or 36 ppm of 1°C**

It must be noted that the results presented in this note are estimated values interpreted from Figures 1 and 2 rather than absolute values. However, I believe that the results obtained **are of the right order.**

In addition, it should be noted that the results presented in this note obtained from the IPCC graph have been ignored as there is ample evidence, referred to in the text and in the Appendix, which show that the IPCC reports are unreliable as they are intended to vigorously promote the global warming fallacy at all costs and to avoid giving any impression of alternative views.

So the question is:

Why are the Conservative, Labour, Lib Dem, Green and SNP parties and many civil servants so keen to destroy the UK economy, knowing that net zero is unachievable and is already ruining the lives and livelihoods of many UK citizens and taxpayers? They are ignoring the best interests of the UK and are complying with the globalist agenda of the WEF, UN, EU and IPCC. If you agree then the remedy is in your hands, so:

**NEVER, EVER VOTE CONSERVATIVE, LABOUR, LIB DEM, GREEN OR SNP AGAIN!**

22/03/24

# THE LUNACY OF NET ZERO AND THE UK's POLITICAL PARTIES POLICIES

## 1 Introduction

Carbon Dioxide, (CO<sub>2</sub>) is a trace gas, currently accounting for about 420 parts/million (ppm) or 0.04% of the atmosphere. It is an essential part of our life, as if it falls below about 150 ppm all vegetation will die and all life on earth with it. (See "Inconvenient Facts" by Gregory Wrightstone.) Satellite images have shown that higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> have increased global greening, which increases life preserving global oxygen levels. Commercial growers also pump CO<sub>2</sub> into their greenhouses to vastly increase plant growth.

Unfortunately, CO<sub>2</sub> is also a "greenhouse" gas, as it does affect the earth's global temperature. It is this aspect of its attributes that has been picked on by the climate alarmists to use, quite wrongly, as a cause of concern by blaming increasing CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere caused by human sources for excessive global warming. This is called Anthropogenic Global Warming, (AGW), which the climate alarmists claim causes serious weather extremes and will melt the polar ice caps and flood vast areas of low-lying land, killing billions of people as a result.

But the earth produces CO<sub>2</sub> naturally and over the past centuries CO<sub>2</sub> levels have been much higher than they are today. (Wrightstone, "Inconvenient Facts, quotes a CO<sub>2</sub> level of 2,500 ppm, 140 million years ago.) Hence their misguided aim to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> to pre-industrial levels at any and all cost, despite the fact that the IPCC states that anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> is only about 3% of the annual total. In addition, water vapour, over which man has no control whatsoever, is by far the largest and most effective greenhouse gas.

The effect of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> on global warming and the earth's surface temperature is discussed below as the hype on AGW is strangely reluctant to quote the temperature changes involved. This is likely because the temperature changes caused by AGW are so small that they would have no impact on the public and would also illustrate what a monumental scam was being played upon them.

## 2 Global Warming

Figure 1 is copied from a lecture given by Dr Tom Sheahan. For the full lecture use the link: [https://m.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR1cW\\_gwilmUFYPL\\_aATSw4lHXQmdf2yYKTd8xOIV8-s-vnIG7m-jPsHlls&v=CqWw26PXqz0&feature=youtu.be](https://m.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR1cW_gwilmUFYPL_aATSw4lHXQmdf2yYKTd8xOIV8-s-vnIG7m-jPsHlls&v=CqWw26PXqz0&feature=youtu.be)

The figure, compiled by Prof Happer, and Dr van Wijngaarden, clearly defines the effect on global warming due to increasing levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. This shows that increasing levels of CO<sub>2</sub> from the pre-industrial level of 280 ppm (parts per million) to the warming effect at today's level of about 420 ppm is practically indiscernible. This shows beyond any doubt that increasing global CO<sub>2</sub> by 140 ppm has an imperceptible effect on increasing earth's temperature. In fact, higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> have even less effect on increasing global temperature. The graph is referred to as (H&vW) in the discussion below.

FIGURE 1

H&vW GRAPH





FIGURE 2, below is based on IPCC published information defining the effect on global temperature with increasing CO<sub>2</sub>. This graph is copied from Gregory Wrightstone's excellent book, "Inconvenient Facts The science Al Gore does not want you to know", It also confirms the shape of the H&vW graph above.

FIGURE 2

IPCC GRAPH



The implications from Figures 1 and 2 are presented in Table 1 below, which shows the total temperature change ( $\Delta T$ ) as CO<sub>2</sub> rises from zero to 800 ppm. (NB The results have been scaled from Figures 1 and 2, so should be regarded as estimates rather than totally accurate values. However, the trend is clear regardless of the values presented. See the Appendix for additional information justifying FIG 1 and for ignoring FIG 2).

TABLE 1 TEMP RISE  $\Delta T$  AGAINST CO<sub>2</sub> ppm INCREASE: FROM FIGURES 1 AND 2

$\Delta$ ppm	HAPPER $\Delta T$	IPCC $\Delta T$	HAPPER TOTAL $\Delta T$	IPCC TOTAL $\Delta T$	CO <sub>2</sub> PPm	HAPPER $\Delta T$	IPCC $\Delta T$	HAPPER TOTAL $\Delta T$	IPCC TOTAL $\Delta T$
20	2.4		2.4		260	0.05		4.54	
40	0.55		2.95		280	0.04		4.58	2.85*
60	0.32		3.27		300	0.03	0.3	4.61	2.94
80	0.3		3.57		350	0.03	0.25	4.64	3.19
100	0.25	1.16	3.82	1.16	400	0.03	0.21	4.67	3.4
120	0.15		3.97		420	0.03		4.7	3.5*
140	0.12		4.09		450	0.03	0.2	4.73	3.6
150		0.65	4.15*	1.81	500	0.03	0.17	4.76	3.77
160	0.1		4.19		550	0.03	0.15	4.79	3.92
180	0.09		4.28		600	0.03	0.14	4.82	4.06
200	0.08	0.48	4.36	2.29	650		0.13		4.19
220	0.07		4.43		700		0.12		4.31
240	0.06		4.49		750		0.11		4.42
250		0.35		2.64	800		0.1		4.52

\* Interpolated

The main points to note are that:

1 The absolute minimum level of 150 ppm required for all vegetation and therefore all life on earth means a temperature increase, from zero  $\Delta T$  at zero CO<sub>2</sub>, of 4.15 °C from H&vW and 1.81 °C from the IPCC.

2 The graphs have a fairly large difference of 2.66 °C at 100 ppm but they gradually converge at much higher concentrations.

3 The global temp increase at the 1830 pre-industrial level of about 280 ppm produced a total temp increase of 4.58 °C according to H&vW and a 2.85 °C increase according to the IPCC.

4 The current, (say 2024) level is about 420 ppm, an increase of 140 ppm over 194 years, or 0.72 ppm/annum.

5 The total temp increase due to the rise in CO<sub>2</sub> to 420 ppm is approximately 4.7 °C (H&vW) and 3.5 °C (IPCC). This means that the global temp *increase* due to increasing CO<sub>2</sub> from 1830 to 2024 is 0.12 °C (H&vW) or 0.65 °C (IPCC).

7 BUT, the human contribution to this global increase, according to the IPCC, is 3% of the total. Hence, the current solution to the so-called global warming to *reduce* global human CO<sub>2</sub> to pre-industrial emissions will only *reduce* the global temperature increase by:

**0.0036 °C (H&vW) or 3,600 ppm of 1 °C**

Or

**0.02 °C (IPCC) or 20,000 ppm of 1 °C**

8 As the UK only contributes 1% of the global human CO<sub>2</sub> this means that the UK will only reduce the global temperature after reducing its CO<sub>2</sub> output to pre-industrial levels by:

**0.000036 °C (H&vW) or 36 ppm of 1°C**

or

**0.0002 °C (IPCC) or 200 ppm of 1°C**

9 So to produce this derisory 36 ppm, or 200 ppm of 1 °C effect on the global warming “crisis” the Conservative, Labour, Lib Dem, Green and SNP parliamentary parties are allegedly all intent on ruining the UK economy and are making the UK citizens lives a misery.

10 Also, it must be noted that *increasing* the current global CO<sub>2</sub> level from 420 ppm to 600 ppm is 4.82 – 4.7, (H&vW) and 4.06 – 3.5 °C, (IPCC) or 0.12 °C (H&vW) or 0.56 °C (IPCC).

11 Hence, increasing the global CO<sub>2</sub> by nearly 50% to 600 ppm from the current level of 420 ppm has a minimal effect on global warming. The global human contribution to that would only be:

**0.0036 °C or 3,600 ppm of 1°C (H&vW)**

or

**0.017°C or 17,000 ppm of 1°C (IPCC)**

of which the UK contribution would be:

**36 ppm of 1°C (H&vW)**

or

**0.00017 °C or 170 ppm of 1°C (IPCC).**

12 It should be noted the huge benefits to food production resulting from the increased CO<sub>2</sub> which promotes world plant growth and agriculture. Higher CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the atmosphere increases food production and more life sustaining oxygen for all living creatures on earth.

13 The total global rise in CO<sub>2</sub> from 1980, (335 ppm) to 2022 (420 ppm) was 85 ppm or 2.02 ppm/annum over the last 42 years. Hence, it will take the earth nearly 90 years to increase the global CO<sub>2</sub> level to 600 ppm at that rate. This will only increase global temp by 0.12 °C (H&vW) or 0.56 °C (IPCC) at that level.

14 Assuming human emissions were 3% of the annual total of 2.02 ppm gives a global increase of 0.0606 ppm/annum. The UK share of that at 1% gives an annual UK emission figure of 0.000606 ppm/annum as the UK’s increase in CO<sub>2</sub> over the last few years.

**This means that it will take approximately 1,650 years for the UK to add just 1 ppm of CO<sub>2</sub> to the global total.**

15 The results derived from the IPCC graph are considered to be unreliable and are therefore being ignored. There is ample evidence that the IPCC's reports and procedures are littered with examples of questionable practice, including many examples where the IPCC has ignored and suppressed evidence that does not support their net zero agenda. Numerous publications, listed in the Appendix, describe in detail the many examples of the IPCC failings.

## CONCLUSION

1 The current hysteria over the "so called" effect of rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels causing disastrous increases in global warming, thereby causing melting of polar ice-caps, more extreme weather conditions etc., etc. is entirely unnecessary.

2 The current rise in global temperature of 4.7 °C, (H&vW), or 3.5 °C (IPCC), due to the current CO<sub>2</sub> level of 420 ppm has already happened and the world is still carrying on as normal.

3 **Increasing** global CO<sub>2</sub> level to 600 ppm will only add 0.12 °C or 0.56 °C to the global total and it will take nearly 90 years to reach that level at the current rate of increase.

4 This misguided rush to reduce global warming by reducing CO<sub>2</sub> to pre-industrial levels is ruining the UK economy, its residents' livelihoods, living standards and freedom of movement.

5 In addition, the drive to net zero is totally unrealistic, totally unachievable and is going to cost the UK trillions of pounds to de-carbonise the grid together with all the other mandatory costs involved.

6 Net zero is however, fully supported by the Conservative, Labour, Lib Dem, Green and SNP parties. as they are ignoring some basic evidence on the limited effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on global warming which is described above.

7 So, why are the Conservative, Labour, Lib Dem, Green and SNP parties and many civil servants so keen to destroy the UK economy and the UK as an independent sovereign country?

8 For example, the drive to net zero has recently resulted in stopping steel production in the UK. Steel was invented in the UK and is an essential strategic commodity. Yet the government, supported by the other parties in parliament, are allegedly quite happy to abolish UK production of this essential material by closing all UK coal powered generating stations.

9 This is clearly ridiculous as 1,893 new coal powered generating stations are being built in the world. The total number in operation will then increase from 3,743 to 5,636. Of these the EU has 465 existing plants and is adding 25 giving a total of 490 plants. The UK has only one plant still operating and that is being closed soon.

10 So, do you really agree that it is in the best interests of the UK to abolish steel making and throw thousands of skilled craftsmen out of work for the sake of saving 36 ppm of 1°C? The Conservative, Labour, Lib Dem, Green, SNP parties and many civil servants allegedly do! They are clearly adopting the diktats of unelected international bodies whose aim is to

impose their policies on the world. The 5 UK political parties listed above are therefore completely ignoring what is best for the UK 's citizens who have voted them into office. They are all therefore totally unfit to be represented in parliament, let alone governing the country in any shape or form.

11 If you agree that these parties are not representing our best interests the solution is in our hands. So,

**NEVER, NEVER VOTE CONSERVATIVE, LABOUR, LIB DEM, GREEN, OR  
SNP AGAIN!**

12 It is also incumbent on the PM, the government and all the climate change fanatics to explain how the UK's  $0.000165\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$  ( $0.55 \times 3\% \times 1\%$ ) maximum extra contribution to global temperature over 194 years, or on average:

**$0.0000008\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C/annum}$**

has endangered the earth so much that it justifies the net zero legislation and all the trauma that goes with it. In addition, it makes Rishi Sunak's donation of £1.6 billion of taxpayer's money to the UN's Climate Change Fund a grossly stupid and irrelevant payment.

13 In addition, the Cabinet Office confirmed they had no record of ANY data whatsoever to support this payment. In other words, it was apparently an impromptu payment to impress other delegates and make Sunak look big in the eyes of the delegates at a COP meeting. Hence, he should be made to reimburse the UK taxpayers out of his own pocket for that amount of taxpayer's money he threw away.

J Wraith

## APPENDIX

### THE ACCURACY AND FEASIBILITY OF THE H&vW and IPCC GRAPHS

The two graphs presented in Figures 1 and 2 of the note are similar in shape but show different results. It is therefore necessary to examine which graph is more meaningful and accurate.


The Happer & van Wijngaarden results in Fig 1 can be justified by means of the following graphs which show excellent co-relation with measured results:

(The figure below, is also copied from the lecture given by Dr Tom Sheahan. For the full lecture use the link:

[https://m.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR1cW\\_gwilmUFYPI\\_aATSw4IHXQmdf2yYKTd8xOI V8-s-vnIG7m-jPsHlls&v=CqWv26PXqz0&feature=youtu.be](https://m.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR1cW_gwilmUFYPI_aATSw4IHXQmdf2yYKTd8xOI V8-s-vnIG7m-jPsHlls&v=CqWv26PXqz0&feature=youtu.be)

**"Methane – The Irrelevant Green-House Gas" Dr Thomas P Sheahan**

### Stunning agreement with measurements



14

With regard to the IPCC results, Andrew Montford's excellent books "The Hockey Stick Illusion" and "Hiding the Decline", which details the history of the "Climategate Affair" show how the IPCC operates. These and other books, (see list below) are essential reading to understand the workings and methods employed by the IPCC. These clearly show that the IPCC, and the authors of IPCC reports are quite willing to edit information and ignore results that do not fit in with their intention to promote global warming at every opportunity

In addition, the graph below, copied from David Craigs excellent book "There is no Climate Crisis", shows the results of IPCC estimates of global temperature increase over time This clearly shows the IPCC results are well over actual results.






Figure 9 – Average of 102 model runs vs satellite and balloon results (1975-2015)

Hence, in view of the above and more evidence of IPCC failings to represent real values it can be assumed that the IPCC results are not reliable and should be ignored.

## References

Christopher Booker, "The Real Global Warming Disaster", Continuum, 2009.

A.W. Montford, "The Hockey Stick Illusion", Stacey International, 2010

A.W. Montford, "Hiding the Decline", Anglosphere Books, 2012

Gregory Wrightstone, "Inconvenient Facts", The science that Al Gore doesn't want you to know, Silver Crown Productions Ltd., LLC, 2017

Bruce C Bunker, PhD, "The Mythology Of Global Warming", Climate Change Fiction vs. Scientific Facts, Moonshine Cove Publishing LLC, 2018

M J Sangster, PhD, "The *Real* Inconvenient Truth", Amazon, 2018

David Craig, "There Is No Climate Disaster", Original Book Company, 2021

Ian Plimer, "Green Murder", A life sentence of Net Zero With No Parole, Connor Court Pty Ltd., 2021

Dr Niall McCrae, RMN, MSc, PhD, "Green in Tooth and Claw", The Misanthropic Mission of Climate Alarm, The Bruges Group, 2023