

# Net-Zero Emissions: A Blind-fold Disaster



There is growing understanding that net-zero (nett zero) emissions is a recipe for disaster. Few people are aware of what Net-Zero emissions really means,<sup>1</sup> so they are supporting a future catastrophe. Here are some quotes to help you understand the danger of this ecological directive by climate activists.

## (1) Nigel Lawson (4-11-2021) “Net Zero is a Disastrous Solution to a Nonexistent Problem”

[notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2021/11/04/nigel-lawson-net-zero-is-a-disastrous-solution-to-a-nonexistent-problem](https://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2021/11/04/nigel-lawson-net-zero-is-a-disastrous-solution-to-a-nonexistent-problem)

*“Decarbonisation, in short, would be an unparalleled economic calamity. So how is it that the UK and most of the western world have signed up to it? The answer can only be conjectural. I suggested at the start that the current climate scare is a quasi-religious hysteria. Mankind seems to have a psychological need for a belief system. Traditionally in the West, this has been Christianity; but with the waning place of Christianity in the modern world, climate catastrophism has emerged to take its place.*

*And needless to say, it is particularly convenient for our political leaders, who will be gone before the full extent of the economic damage caused by the measures they advocate becomes apparent. Meanwhile, whatever errors they may commit in this non-deferential age, they can pass themselves off as saviours of the planet.*

*But whatever the cause of the climate change madness, the effect is clear. While global warming is not a problem, the policies intended to prevent it are a disaster.”*

(ORIGINAL ARTICLE: “Net Zero is a Disastrous Solution to a Nonexistent Problem”  
[www.spectator.co.uk/article/net-zero-is-a-disastrous-solution-to-a-nonexistent-problem](http://www.spectator.co.uk/article/net-zero-is-a-disastrous-solution-to-a-nonexistent-problem) )

## (2) Steve Baker (11-10-2021) “‘Winging it’ for Net Zero is a catastrophe waiting to happen”

[notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2021/10/11/winging-it-for-net-zero-is-a-catastrophe-waiting-to-happen-steve-baker](https://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2021/10/11/winging-it-for-net-zero-is-a-catastrophe-waiting-to-happen-steve-baker)

*“The CCC also says we can get a bit of power from gas-fired power stations equipped with carbon capture and storage (CCS). However, the practical problems are again fairly stark; nobody has yet made a success of CCS – a series of pilot projects have tested the waters on the easier ground of coal-fired power stations, and each has been closed as an economic failure; the power they produce is simply too expensive. And nobody has yet got the technology to work at all for gas-fired power stations.*

*The other problem with planning for gas and CCS to deliver us from the perils of intermittency is that it appears unlikely we are going to have any cheap gas to feed them with – successive governments, egged on by the CCC, the renewables industry, and the green movement have told us we must “keep fossil fuels in the ground”. This was seen in part as a way to encourage the second part of the decarbonisation strategy, namely for people to “invent something”. In other words, if we have no gas and no way to balance the grid, well, someone will come up with some way to fix the problem. So we first made the electricity grid unwelcoming for gas-fired power stations, then we neutered the nascent shale gas industry with absurd regulations, and then we banned it completely.*

*Which brings us to where we are today, with the whole country crossing its fingers and praying that someone will “invent something”, or at least find us a way to make it through the winter without the lights going out.”*

1 – “What Actually is 'Net-Zero Emissions'” [canberraforerunners.org/wp-content/uploads/What-Actually-is-Net-Zero-Emissions.pdf](https://canberraforerunners.org/wp-content/uploads/What-Actually-is-Net-Zero-Emissions.pdf)

(3) Duncan McLaren (20-10-2019) **“The problem with net-zero emissions targets”**  
[www.carbonbrief.org/guest-post-the-problem-with-net-zero-emissions-targets](http://www.carbonbrief.org/guest-post-the-problem-with-net-zero-emissions-targets)

*“But the main problem is that most NETs<sup>2</sup> are still only prospective technologies – they do not exist as large-scale socio-technical systems ready for deployment. Our stakeholder workshops highlighted huge uncertainties in how – or in some cases, whether – different NETs might work technically, economically and politically.*

*Net-zero plans that rely on promises of future carbon removal – instead of reducing emissions now – are, therefore, placing a risky bet. If the technologies anticipated to remove huge quantities of carbon in the 2040s and 2050s fail to work as expected – or lead to rebounds in emissions from land-use change, for example – then it might not be practical to compensate for the cumulative emissions from mitigation foregone between now and then.”<sup>3</sup>*

*“NETs have been included in climate modelling and policy pathways for many years, but have not generally been clearly signposted. Their growing role has often remained hidden within charts showing falling emissions, until after 2050, when overall emissions become net-negative.”<sup>4</sup>*

*“Even if emissions were brought to net-zero by 2050, the world would likely still need to achieve “net-negative” emissions for a period, to reduce atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations back to safer levels. At least some countries and sectors will need to go “beyond net-zero”. ”<sup>5</sup>*

(4) Fred Pearce (May 25, 2021) **“Net-Zero Emissions: Winning Strategy or Destined for Failure?”**  
[e360.yale.edu/features/net-zero-emissions-winning-strategy-or-destined-for-failure](http://e360.yale.edu/features/net-zero-emissions-winning-strategy-or-destined-for-failure)

*“Net-zero emissions — balancing emissions by absorbing equivalent amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere — is the defining approach of international climate efforts. But some scientists are arguing that this strategy simply allows the perpetuation of the status quo and is certain to fail.”*

*“U.S. Forest Service says 11 percent of national CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are “offset” by American forests. If the world’s two biggest emitters start claiming that the carbon being absorbed in these existing forests could be offset against their emissions to achieve net zero, then the scientific basis for net-zero policies to end climate change would swiftly unravel.”*

(5) James Dyke (22-4-2021) **“Climate Scientists: Concept of net zero is a dangerous trap”**  
[theconversation.com/climate-scientists-concept-of-net-zero-is-a-dangerous-trap-157368](http://theconversation.com/climate-scientists-concept-of-net-zero-is-a-dangerous-trap-157368)



**Over the years doubt has developed into dread. This gnawing sense that we have made a terrible mistake. There are now times when I freely admit to a sense of panic. How did we get this so wrong? What are our children supposed to think about how we have acted?**

James Dyke  
Senior Lecturer in Global Systems, University of Exeter

2 – “negative emissions technologies”

3 – QUOTE: By Duncan McLaren

4 – QUOTE: By Duncan McLaren

5 – QUOTE: By Duncan McLaren



**It's astonishing how the continual absence of any credible carbon removal technology seems to never affect net zero policies. Whatever is thrown at it, net zero carries on without a dent in the fender.**

**For some time I assumed I was merely ill-informed or over-cautious. I've now realised that we have all been subject to a form of gaslighting. Whether it's BECCS, afforestation, direct air capture or carbon absorbing unicorns, the assumption is that net zero will work because it has to work. But beyond fine words and glossy brochures there is nothing there. The emperor has no clothes.**

**James Dyke**

**Senior Lecturer in Global Systems, University of Exeter**



**Relying on untested carbon dioxide removal mechanisms to achieve the Paris targets when we have the technologies to transition away from fossil fuels today is plain wrong and foolhardy. Why are we willing to gamble the lives and livelihoods of millions of people, the beautiful life all around us, and the futures of our children?**

**Robert Watson**

**Emeritus Professor in Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia**



**The predecessor to net zero was and still is called 'offsetting'. Once I was full of hope that carbon offsetting schemes could do the trick and save intact forest ecosystems from almost certain destruction by economic development. Now I know this was just a dream.**

**The massive amount of offsetting needed for staying within safe climate limits cannot be met by leaving nature alone. It demands fast growing, mostly alien species that are cut down often and regularly, with devastating consequences for biodiversity. We are already seeing the beginning of it in European forests. I am scared almost more by the consequences of net zero, than by those of climate warming.**

**Wolfgang Knorr**

**Senior Research Scientist, Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science, Lund University**



It came to me as a real shock that I must have contributed personally to the net zero trap. In 2008 the G8 countries declared a voluntary target of reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 50% by 2050.

Back then, I responded by publishing computations I had performed specifically to show the need for net zero in the long run, stating that any remaining carbon dioxide emissions by human activities would have to be 'balanced by an artificial sink'.

But since none of our study's co-authors was an expert, we did not consider how much of that artificial sink would be needed to sustain our economic system, or if it was even technically possible to create.

**Wolfgang Knorr**

Senior Research Scientist, Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science, Lund University

*“Instead of confronting our doubts, we scientists decided to construct ever more elaborate fantasy worlds in which we would be safe. The price to pay for our cowardice: having to keep our mouths shut about the ever growing absurdity of the required planetary-scale carbon dioxide removal.”<sup>6</sup>*

Laurence

17-10-2021

[Published on 5-12-2021]

([www.CanberraForerunners.org](http://www.CanberraForerunners.org))

COPYRIGHT

This document is free to copy, republish and distribute, but only 'as is'. It is free to quote from at length.

All Canberra Forerunners' documents are licensed under

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)

Quotes are the copyright of their authors.

Free graphics are from [www.clker.com](http://www.clker.com) & free photos are from [commons.wikimedia.org](https://commons.wikimedia.org) unless otherwise credited.