

# **Response to Consultation on “De-carbonizing Transport” in the UK**

**by Neil Lock**



[neil@honestcommonsense.co.uk](mailto:neil@honestcommonsense.co.uk)

July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020

© 2020 Neil Humphrey Lock



# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>About the author</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.Introduction and Background</b>	<b>5</b>
Building civilization	5
Reasonable expectations of government	6
The enemies of civilization	9
How well has government performed?	11
<b>2.The climate change allegations</b>	<b>12</b>
Evaluating the allegations	13
Where is the proof of our guilt?	14
Would a zero-carbon economy be sustainable?	17
<b>3.History of the green agenda</b>	<b>18</b>
1970 to 1992	18
Climate change	20
The mad parliament	26
Species extinction	29
Air pollution	29
<b>4.Some numbers</b>	<b>30</b>
Effects of eliminating fossil fuels	30
The social cost of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	31
How much do we already pay in CO <sub>2</sub> taxes?	32
<b>5.Transport options in the UK</b>	<b>33</b>
The car	33
Buses	34
Trains	35
Air travel	36
Cycling and walking	36
<b>6.Indictments, diagnosis and cure</b>	<b>37</b>
Indictments against the UK government	37
Indictments against activists, media and academe	39
What went wrong?	41
What is to be done?	44
<b>7.Comments on “setting the challenge”</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>8.My response to the consultation</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>55</b>

## Preface

“When you are studying any matter or considering any philosophy, ask yourself only what are the facts and what is the truth that the facts bear out. Never let yourself be diverted either by what you wish to believe or by what you think would have beneficent social effects if it were believed, but look only, and solely, at what are the facts.”

– *Bertrand Russell*

This pamphlet is my response to a UK government consultation on “de-carbonizing transport” – Ref [1]. This consultation marks the first opportunity for ordinary people to respond to the politicians’ foolish, needless and damaging “zero carbon” goal for the UK, and to policies proposed to implement it. Because I felt a need to include some quite detailed supporting information, what started out as a paper of a few pages quickly grew into a short book.

The UK government has recently put forward proposals that amount to severely restricting, and in the future destroying, our freedom to choose which means of transport meet our needs best. All this comes from a bill the parliament passed in June 2019, that commits everyone in the UK to a “zero carbon” future. Meaning, that they want the UK economy to be a zero nett emitter of carbon dioxide gas by the year 2050. In typically arrogant fashion, the politicians made a huge commitment that will damage the lives of millions, without allowing any say at all to the people they are supposed to be representing and serving.

This “zero carbon” idea, in its turn, comes about because of two allegations that have been levelled against our modern civilization. One, that emissions of carbon dioxide gas from human activities are causing, and will in the future cause, a large and unprecedented increase in temperatures on a world-wide scale. Two, that this will have catastrophic consequences on the planet as a whole, and so on human well-being. Neither of these allegations has ever been proven beyond reasonable doubt. Indeed, for those of us

who follow Bertrand Russell's lead as quoted above, and seek the truth, the closer we look at the facts the plainer it becomes that the "catastrophic anthropogenic climate change" foofaraw is, and always has been, a scam.

And yet, the media, with the BBC in the forefront, continue to blast out scares about the dreadful future they say is in store because of "climate change." To the extent that in March 2020 it was reported – Ref [2] – that almost a fifth of a sample of UK children said that their fears about climate change were causing them nightmares.

It seems bizarre that the alarmist machinations are still going at full speed ahead, while at the same time prominent environmentalists are starting to decamp from the climate change bandwagon. Only a month ago, a well-known US environmentalist, Michael Shellenberger, published an article – Ref [3] – in which he publicly apologized for his part in climate alarmism. He said: "Climate change is happening. It's just not the end of the world. It's not even our most serious environmental problem." And: "Once you realize just how badly misinformed we have been, often by people with plainly unsavory or unhealthy motivations, it is hard not to feel duped."

Beyond those directly involved in this consultation, my intended audience for this pamphlet is three-fold. First, the sizeable portion of the general population who, like me, are not convinced by the alarmist rhetoric. And many of whom, moreover, are not willing to make sacrifices for a cause they don't believe in. Second, people in government, academe and elsewhere, who are becoming concerned that what their green activist colleagues are doing is likely to alienate the general public, and who want to avoid themselves being brought into disrepute as a result. Third, and probably most important in the short run, those few who have some degree of political influence, but are either new to politics, or have managed to remain uncorrupted by the system. And who are, therefore, willing to look at, and to act on, the facts, instead of toeing the establishment line.

## **About the author**

My name is Neil Lock. I was trained as a mathematician, taking my degree at Trinity College, Cambridge. But, having decided the academic world was not for me, I went into the then new and expanding software industry.

For almost 50 years, I have been productive in many different roles in that industry. I have been programmer, designer, team leader, spec writer, project manager, consultant, group manager, technical documenter, tester, and most points in between. In 1993 I went independent, and was successful as a consultant for some years; until New Labour destroyed my career with a bad tax law called IR35. I will never, ever forgive them for that. Nor will I ever forgive the Tories for failing to repeal it.

Politically, I am neither left nor right; I have contempt for both. Indeed, I feel disgusted by politics as a whole, by all the mainstream UK political parties, and by the great majority of those that take an active part in politics. Thus, I have not voted in any general election since 1987.

I am dismayed by the course that Western politics, and politics in the UK in particular, has taken in the last 50 years or so. The political class have shown ever increasing disdain and scorn towards the people they are supposed to be serving. They and their green activist comrades have schemed to suffocate, and in time to destroy, the Western industrial civilization, which we human beings have so laboriously built over the last 200+ years. This pamphlet represents my shot at a first step on the road towards taking back our civilization and stopping the green wreckers.

For those who prefer to take in their information via the spoken word rather than the written, in August 2019 I gave a talk (of almost an hour) on “The War on Cars,” which covers some of the detail in this pamphlet. You can find it at Ref [4].

## 1. Introduction and Background

In this chapter, I will outline my case against the “zero carbon” agenda and policies derived from it. I’ll begin at the foundation, with the question “what are we here for?” My answer to that question is: to build and to spread civilization. Next, I’ll ask: what are reasonable expectations for us to have about how a modern, democratic government will behave towards us? Then, I’ll look at our enemies, that want to stop us doing what is natural to us. And specifically, at the green wreckers that want to force us back to a pre-industrial age. Finally, I’ll ask: How well is government, and the UK government in particular, living up to our reasonable expectations?

### Building civilization

What are we here for? An age-old question. The traditional answer, often given by the religious, is that we are custodians of planet Earth. I can see where they’re coming from; but I think we’re far more than that. As I see this matter, the Earth’s resources – whether animal, vegetable, mineral, or of other kinds – are not there merely to be conserved. They are there for us to use wisely, in order to fulfil our potential; our *human* potential.

When I look back through history, I see an often-repeated pattern of human progress: the building of civilization. I look back to ancient Athens. I look back to Rome. I look back to the time, shortly after the first millennium, when – partly, perhaps, because of warmer weather due to what we now call the Mediaeval Warm Period – commerce started to grow across southern Europe. I look back to the Renaissance, to its re-discovery of the legacy of Greece and Rome, and to the voyages of discovery it set off. I look back to the Enlightenment, and to the new values it brought; I’ll discuss those in more detail in the next section. I look back to the civilized countries which were founded explicitly on those values, and in particular to the success of the American revolution.

I think of the Industrial Revolution, and the entrepreneurial spirit and great improvement in living standards which it brought. I think of the energy revolution, which has enabled us to keep warm in winter, and cool in summer. I think of the transport revolution, which has enabled us to travel, globally and locally, in comfort and at reasonable cost, where and when we want or need to. I think of the technology and computer revolution. I think of the communications revolution and the Internet. All these things have made us able to live in a more civilized way. So much so, that they have brought us close to the threshold of world-wide human civilization.

Thus, my answer to “What are we here for?” is: To build and to spread civilization. As individuals, living in just, honest civilization can enable each of us to develop our particular talents and creativity, to be the best we can be. And as a species, it can enable us to fulfil our human potential.

### **Reasonable expectations of government**

Government is a necessary evil, wrote Tom Paine in his famous 1776 pamphlet “Common Sense.” I agree with him on both points. Governance is necessary in any civilized community. But if not constrained to behave within reasonable bounds, it becomes an evil; a drain on us, and a danger to us. So, I’ll ask: What standards of behaviour ought people in a modern democracy, such as the UK, reasonably be able to expect from those who govern them?

The modern idea of democracy has its roots in the Enlightenment of the late 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. What has since become the UK was the birthplace of the Enlightenment. Englishman John Locke, and his scientist friends such as Anglo-Irishman Robert Boyle, were followed by Scottish thinkers like David Hume and Adam Smith. As a result, Enlightenment ideas spread to the rest of Europe, and eventually to almost all of the world.

There are differing viewpoints on what the Enlightenment was, and what it did. But here is a list of some of its key values: The use of human reason, and the pursuit of science. Greater tolerance in religion. Freedom of thought and action. Natural rights, natural equality of all human beings, and human dignity. The idea that society exists for the individual, not the individual for society. Government for the benefit of, and with the consent of, the governed. The rule of law and justice. A desire for human progress, and a rational optimism for the future.

In any system based on these ideas, I think, you should expect government always to be *reasonable* towards the people it governs. You should expect it to be respectful of the facts in any matter. And you should expect government always to seek and to present the facts truthfully, accurately and honestly. And it should never present mere theories or hypotheses as if they were facts.

Moreover, you should expect government to serve the people, not to rule over them. You should expect it to act for the benefit of the governed, not for the benefit of particular vested interests or political factions. And you should expect it to act for the benefit of *all* the governed, that is every individual among them – real criminals excepted, of course. You should expect it to respect *your* rights and *your* dignity as a human being; provided, of course, that you behave as a human being. You should expect it to allow maximum freedom of action, thought and choice (economic, personal and social) for everyone, consistent with living in a civilized community. You should expect it to apply the same rules to everyone, including itself. You should expect it to refrain from picking winners and losers, except on the basis of how individuals behave. And you should expect it to look kindly on activities which improve human capabilities, convenience, comfort and happiness.

In a system that claims to be a democracy, I think you should expect government to keep to additional standards of good behaviour. Since those elected into power (whether

you voted for them or not) are supposed to be your representatives, they ought to be on *your* side. They ought always to support the interests of the people they “represent” against encroachment by other political interests. For example, MPs in rural areas ought to champion the car as the best means of transport for people in their areas, even when it is pooh-poohed and threatened by the big-city slickers.

And if you’re an honest person, who always strives to act towards others in good faith, government must always act with integrity and in good faith towards you. You should be able to rely on everyone in government being truthful, honest and transparent towards you, and the rest of the public, at all times. You should expect this to apply also to anyone who is receiving taxpayers’ money. Bad faith towards the people ought to mean end of career for anyone in, or funded by, government. And beyond that, government should have procedures to prevent anyone in it, or funded by it, defrauding the people, or otherwise acting in bad faith towards the people.

Moreover, government and its agents must respect your human rights, and always follow due process of law. In particular, if government makes an accusation against you and threatens actions against your interests, it must allow you full procedural rights. Such as: A clear statement of the accusation. An objective and impartial tribunal to judge it. The right to speak up in your own defence; to call witnesses, including experts; and to have your side of the case heard in public. And the presumption of innocence, until the accusation has been proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Beyond this, government must never take any action that unjustly harms the governed. To this end, it must do honest, objective, accurate analyses of the costs and benefits of any proposed actions, and make them public. And it must never make costly commitments on behalf of the governed, without rigorous justification.

In particular, if someone's actions cause an externality, such as pollution, the compensation they must pay to the victims must be fairly and objectively assessed, according to the social cost of the externality. That is, the total cost to all those affected by it. Moreover, their liability must be restricted to their particular proportion of it. And the compensation ought to be routed to the victims, in proportion to the damage each has suffered. Government should take out only as much as is necessary to support the assessment of perpetrators and victims, and the routing of the compensation.

And if it seems that a problem may require some people to make lifestyle sacrifices, then three things must happen first. One: good, true, clear, objective, quantitative reasons must be provided. Two: the need for sacrifice must be proven beyond reasonable doubt. And three: the amount of the sacrifice must be kept to the absolute minimum.

### **The enemies of civilization**

But there are some among us, that don't want us to advance our human civilization, to make it better and better.

Some of them, usually at the top of the social pyramid, are happy with the system as it is, and want to keep everything that way. These are often called "conservatives." They fall into two main groups. The less virulent ones are merely selfish. They enjoy the pleasures of being at the top of the heap, but don't have a strong desire to harm other people. More malign conservatives want to manipulate the system for their own benefit, and don't care about the consequences to other people. The Tory landowners that schemed to make the Corn Laws in 1815 are an example.

Other enemies of civilization go further, and want to impose, by force if necessary, their particular vision of the world on as many people as they can. History shows that when these extremists get political power, the consequences are appalling. Think of Hitler, Stalin and Pol Pot.

Even more extreme are those that want to reverse our human progress, and force us all back and down to an earlier age. Deep green environmentalists fall into this category. And I'm not surprised that their current targets for repression and eventual suppression are three of the areas where we have made the biggest advances in the last 200 years or so: industry, energy and transport.

Deep green environmentalists have been scheming for more than 50 years now, seeking to force on to the people of the West their tyrannical vision. For those of us who value earned prosperity, honesty, individual justice and freedom of choice, that vision is virulently opposed to our own. They hate the free market economy, and want to destroy our Western industrial societies. And they seek to suppress the individual human being, and his and her freedoms, independence and chances of happiness.

The core of their belief system seems to be that humans are not special; that we are mere animals, no better than any other species. And that the good of something they call the environment takes priority over the good of human beings. Indeed, extremists among them take the view that we should not be having any impact on this environment at all. You can't get any viewpoint more extreme, or more conservative, than that! Of course, it also invites the reply: If *you* are mere animals, where do you get the right to tell us human beings what we should do?

They seek to implement their goals through corrupting governments. They worm themselves into positions of power, both direct and advisory. They inject their hateful ideology into what ought to be government for the benefit of the governed. They brook no opposition. They are undemocratic; they do not care about the wishes of the people. And when they achieve one goal, they simply re-group and go for something even more extreme.

Over the last 50 years or so, the environmentalists have become expert at lobbying politicians and governments, and

at trumpeting and hyping (mostly untrue) scares and alarms. They have infiltrated government and universities. They permeate virtually all the mainstream political parties in the UK and in other Western democracies. And the mainstream media are, with only a very few exceptions, strongly on the alarmist side. It has become commonplace for those of us skeptical of the alarmist propaganda to be denied a voice, and labelled with nasty names like “flat earther” or “denier.” There are even moves afoot to classify what they call “climate change denialism” as a hate crime.

In many ways, the green movement is like a religion. And an extremely intolerant one, at that. If you disagree with their dogmas, or you don’t want to make any sacrifices for them, you’ll get branded a heretic or worse. If you are succeeding in attracting others to your skeptical views, they will probably try to “de-platform” you. Although they don’t use much physical violence (yet), there is a lot in common between the green extremists and ISIS in the Middle East.

They want to throw away the progress and betterment in our civilization, which we have made over two centuries. And they want to do it *gladly*. For me, the green wreckers, and the politicians and others that support their schemes, are traitors to human civilization. They deserve to be expelled from our civilization, and denied all its benefits.

### **How well has government performed?**

So, how well have Western governments in general, and the UK government in particular, performed in dealing with environmental issues, and “climate change” in particular? How well have they measured up to our reasonable expectations of how democratic government should behave towards the governed?

My answer is: Atrociously. And in this pamphlet, I’ll give my evidence for that assertion.

## 2. The climate change allegations

“Climate change” is the phrase, with which the accusers usually identify their claims. These words replaced, some years ago, the original moniker of “global warming.”

But if you ask yourself “what, specifically, are they accusing us of?” you’ll find that “climate change” is an over-simplification. Indeed, it is a mis-representation. Here, again, is my best statement of the allegations. “One, that emissions of carbon dioxide gas from human activities are causing, and will in the future cause, a large and unprecedented increase in temperatures on a world-wide scale. Two, that this will have catastrophic consequences on the planet as a whole, and so on human well-being.”

At first sight, this looks like a really easy issue to clear up. All we need do is look at the facts of the case, and judge according to those facts. Either the alarms are justified, or they are not. And that decision can be made objectively, using hard, factual evidence and honest, unbiased science. There should not be any clash of values between alarmists and skeptics. There should not be any need to bring politics into it, or to resort to dirty tricks or name-calling.

In a sane system, and particularly in a democracy, would you not expect that the facts of such a case would have been debated freely and fully, in a forum accessible to the general public, under impartial moderation, with all points of view reported in the media? So that everyone can make up their own minds on the issue, and have their views fully taken into account? I have never heard of any such debate.

No; governments press on with destructive, freedom-killing schemes like “zero carbon,” and even seek to bring forward their implementation dates. While the scares and hype of the alarmist point of view are trumpeted all over the media. Meanwhile, skeptics are largely ignored, and attempts made to suppress our voices. Even suspecting that the climate change allegations *might* be flawed is enough to get you labelled “denier” or heretic.

Meanwhile, many ordinary people seem to think the whole issue is unimportant, and prefer to tune out all the hubbub. Polls have consistently shown that climate change doesn't rank high at all on most people's list of problems that need solving. Indeed, it often comes dead last. There is a huge disconnect here between the political class and the ordinary people they are supposed to be serving.

### **Evaluating the allegations**

If an objective auditor were asked to investigate these accusations, he would need to elucidate, using only hard evidence and logical deductions, answers to four questions:

1. Is it warming on a global scale, and if so, by how much?
2. If there is significant global warming, how much of it is caused by human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>; and how much more warming should we expect in the future from that cause?
3. If there is significant warming, from whatever cause, what would be the likely consequences for human civilization?
4. If there are significant likely negative consequences of warming to human civilization, what are the costs and benefits (to all the parties involved) of: (a) "adaptation," that is, reacting to problems only as they arise? Or (b) "mitigation," that is, putting in place schemes which might abate some of the human-caused problems?

To the first question: Is it warming? Yes; it has been warming since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and is still doing so today. Before that, it was cooling down from the Mediaeval Warm Period. And before that, it was warming. That is what climate does; it changes. Always has done, and always will. Even without any human intervention.

But is there evidence of anything unusual, above and beyond what we have seen in the past, in the variability of the temperatures in recent decades? My own answer is the Scottish verdict: Not proven.

To the second question: How much of this warming is caused by human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>? My answer is: Probably some, but it's very uncertain how much. There are other factors in play; and some of them are unknowns. For example, we have no clear idea of what caused the Mediaeval Warm Period. As to the future, such "evidence" as we have is provided only by computer models, and they are – to say the least – dubious.

To the third: What would be the effects of significant warming on human civilization? I answer: Unsure, but given that human civilizations have flourished in past periods of relative warmth – Minoan, Roman and Mediaeval warm periods – I would expect that a moderate warming (say, 2 to 4 degrees Celsius over a century or so) would actually be beneficial overall. To me, the only credible downside of such moderate warming is a bit of sea level rise; but we should be able to deal with that. After all, the Dutch have been doing it successfully for many centuries.

As to the fourth question, I find the reactive approach (adaptation) far better, because you don't waste resources on problems that are not real. The pro-active approach (mitigation) is not only far more expensive, but risks not producing any benefits, or making problems worse, or even having side-effects that create new problems. So, my view is that action should only be taken to solve "problems" when it is clear that there is a real problem to be solved.

### **Where is the proof of our guilt?**

The "zero carbon" agenda, and the transport proposals being made as a result, will without doubt cause economic and lifestyle damage, inconvenience and loss of freedom to a lot of people. So, where is the justification for them? What have we done, to deserve such treatment? Why should any of us accept any restrictions, without first seeing hard, objective, incontrovertible evidence of what it is that we are supposed to have done wrong, and why it was wrong?

In a country like the UK, supposedly based on the rule of law, a charge such as causing catastrophic global climate change ought to be tried under due process of law. Ought it not? With all sides telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

And we have human rights, too. If accused of a murder, for example, each of us must be presumed innocent until proven guilty. So, it's up to the accusers to substantiate their case beyond reasonable doubt. We also have the right to fair judgement by an independent and impartial tribunal. And each of us has the right to speak up in our own defence, and to call whatever witnesses, including experts, we find necessary for our defence.

Moreover, how much stronger should the safeguards be, when the future of our entire civilization is at stake? Should not the charges be debated and assessed, objectively and rationally, in an open and honest forum, free from all political, emotional or media bias? Should not those involved in the assessment, on all sides, be required to give their evidence under oath, on penalty of perjury or worse if they lie, fabricate or mislead? Should not the charges themselves, and the conduct of those promoting them, first undergo a thorough audit by independent, honest, unbiased parties? And if the case is not proven beyond reasonable doubt, should the charges not be dismissed? Or if there has been any misconduct at all by the accusers in the case, should the charges not be dismissed with prejudice?

Now, I for one see no hard, objective, conclusive evidence being put forward that we humans are causing catastrophic global warming through our emissions of carbon dioxide gas. Where is the evidence? Not theories, not computer models, not what-ifs, not guesstimates with huge error bounds and uncertainties. Just evidence: observable facts, and rational deductions from them, which can be independently verified.

Where, for example, are the millions of climate refugees our accusers claim? The thousands of polar bears, and hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of coral reefs, they claim died because of human-caused global warming? Where is the proof, beyond reasonable doubt, that weather is getting worse on a global scale as they claim, and that the cause is human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>? And where is the proof, beyond reasonable doubt, that global sea level rise is accelerating abnormally, and for that same reason?

I'll give you a cautionary tale from the past. In the early 1980s, damage to trees was discovered in several German forests. This took on the name *Waldsterben*. Claims were put forward that this was a new problem. That it was caused by increasing levels of many different air pollutants, at the time branded as "acid rain." That all species of trees were hit by it. That it developed very rapidly, and many trees would die of it within 10 years. And those making these claims urged that immediate action must be taken.

After more than a decade of research, forest scientists concluded that this was not a new problem at all. Similar damage had been observed as far back as the 1920s. It had different causes in different tree species; for example, a fungus attacking the tree roots of spruce. And apart from some damage caused by sulphur dioxide from eastern European communist industry, there was no correlation between the damage to trees and the level of air pollution. By about 1993, *Waldsterben* as a scientific theory had gone the same way as phlogiston.

But for more than a decade, alarmists were allowed to push their claims and to demand action. It is well said that "a lie can get halfway around the world while truth is pulling its boots on." And in the last month, indeed, there have been fresh reports of damage to Swiss forests; this time, claimed to be caused by heat stress due to climate change! Though people with forest knowledge are suggesting that the real culprit is a bark beetle. Could this be *Waldsterben déjà vu*?

## Would a zero-carbon economy be sustainable?

The Rio Declaration, to which the politicians signed up back in 1992, was supposed to ensure that development based on it would be “sustainable.” Now, I understand this word to mean “capable of being sustained,” or otherwise “able to endure into the future.” So, I ask: Would the zero-carbon economy, which the politicians seem to think is so necessary and urgent, actually *be* sustainable? Would it be able to endure into the future? Or would it, if put into practice, fail; for example, leading to widespread starvation like Stalin’s *holodomor*, or people freezing to death?

More generally, should not any contemplated political action, on the kind of scale the zero carbon advocates seek, first be tried out on a small scale, to check that it would have no negative effects? And would not failure to prototype the effects of such a proposed action be an egregious violation of the true precautionary principle, “Look before you leap?”

It’s amusing to think how we might create such a prototype. Set aside a suitable zone, and run an experiment there to find if a zero-carbon economy is sustainable or not. Require all those – activists, politicians, bureaucrats, corrupt academics, celebrities, media figures, and all the rest – that have promoted or supported the zero-carbon agenda, to go live in that area. Monitor that the zone doesn’t emit any more CO<sub>2</sub> than comes in. And though they may trade with people outside the bounds of their zone, the zone must be economically self-sufficient. They have to prove that a zero-carbon economy can survive and prosper without subsidies, grants, or gifts of money or goods from outside – including from government. (*Especially* from government!)

Then, let’s just leave them there; and get on with our own lives in our own ways. If they succeed in the experiment, we’ll see them in 2050. If not, it will both prove them wrong and serve them right; and all human beings worth the name will say “good riddance.”

### **3. History of the green agenda**

#### **1970 to 1992**

Those of you who have studied the green agenda will already know that the driver of it, all along, has been the United Nations. This has been so for 50 years; ever since 1970, the year of the first Earth Day. The then UN Secretary General, U Thant, personally sanctioned the Earth Day idea.

In 1972, the UN Environment Program (UNEP) was started, under the directorship of Maurice Strong. Strong was a Canadian oil baron, and he had a scandal ridden career. His attitude can be summed up by the following quote, from a 1997 magazine interview: “Frankly, we may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrial civilization to collapse.” Later, Strong was implicated in the Oil-for-Food scandal of 2005, went to live in China, and died in 2015.

When the dust has settled enough that historians can write an objective history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I think Strong will be right up there with Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung and Pol Pot in the race for most evil individual of the century. Stalin committed genocide in Ukraine, starting a famine that killed millions; and caused millions of deaths in other parts of the Soviet Union, too. Mao attempted genocide against the people of his country. Pol Pot did the same, but on a smaller scale. Hitler was responsible for the Holocaust against Jews and others. But Strong went further than any of them; he set out to bring down our Western civilization, world-wide.

In 1982, the UN put forward a Resolution called the World Charter for Nature. This included extreme and totalitarian statements, like: “Activities which might have an impact on nature shall be controlled.” And: “Where potential adverse effects are not fully understood, the activities should not proceed.” The Charter was passed in the UN by 111 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions. The USA was the only country voting against.

In 1987, a new UN report was published, titled *Our Common Future*. This is the document, which set in motion the green political juggernaut that has had a huge adverse effect on the lives of all good people in the Western world. Unsurprisingly, Maurice Strong was on the commission that produced it.

*Our Common Future* raised alarms about fourteen issues: Desertification. Clearing of forests. Species loss. Acid rain. Global warming, due to human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. Ozone layer depletion. Loss of coral reefs. Military proliferation and the threat of nuclear war. Toxic and nuclear waste disposal. Increasing incidence of disasters. Population growth. Poverty. International economic inequality. And what they called “the interests of future generations.”

On many of these issues, much progress has been made in the intervening decades. Poverty in the third world and population growth in the West, for example, have both been much reduced. So have emissions of serious pollutants like sulphur dioxide. The ozone layer has recovered. Desertification and forest clearing are no longer major problems. Things are getting better on several of the others, too. And claimed recent loss of species and of coral reefs have not been proven beyond doubt to be either real problems or caused by humans. Haven't we done well?

Of these issues, three are today being actively pushed. Acid rain has been re-badged as air quality. Species loss is still being hyped, as shown by the name of extremist group Extinction Rebellion. And the global warming scare is being hyped hardest of all.

As to transport, *Our Common Future* focused mainly on cars in third world countries and cities. The agenda to force people in the West out of our cars came later. And interestingly, *Our Common Future* fails to mention air transport at all.

In 1988, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established. It's a UN organization. Its mission

statement is: “to provide governments at all levels with scientific information that they can use to develop climate policies. IPCC reports are also a key input into international climate change negotiations.” It has prepared five major reports so far; the first in 1990, the most recent in 2013. Superficially, it looks as if it should be independent and unbiased. But of course, being a UN organization, it is not.

*Our Common Future* led to the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, to whose extreme agenda politicians like then UK prime minister, John Major, signed up without consulting the people. As I like to put it, they sold us all down the Rio. In particular, they signed up to a binding *Framework Convention on Climate Change*, and to *Agenda 21* (which has since morphed into *Agenda 2030*). They also signed up to the *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*, stating 27 principles intended to achieve something called “sustainable development.”

The *Framework Convention on Climate Change* led to the yearly “Conference of the Parties” (COP) meetings, about which you will have heard so much. As to *Agenda 21*, it includes demands such as: “Significant changes in the consumption patterns of industries, governments, households and individuals.” And “Favouring high-occupancy public transport.” This was where the agenda came in of seeking to force drivers in Western countries out of our cars. Moreover, *Agenda 21* was to be implemented at the local government level. So, it passed under many people’s political radar. A clever trick, no?

### **Climate change**

Soon after Rio, the UK spin machine went into overdrive. Our TV screens showed (staged) pictures of rural roads chock-a-block with cars. Of traffic jams in foggy weather, complete with smoking exhaust-pipes. Of the aftermaths of accidents. It was hard, even then, to avoid thinking that we drivers were being set up. And organizations that should have defended us, like the Automobile Association,

abdicated their responsibility. Worse, they even took part in the witch-hunt, blaming us for destroying the environment by driving our “gas guzzlers”.

Around the same time, there were attempts in parliament to set binding targets for reductions in road traffic. The first of these was made in 1994 by a Welsh nationalist MP, with a bill that had actually been written by Friends of the Earth and the Green Party! Not exactly independent or unbiased, then. And not representing the people, either.

A Road Traffic Reduction Act followed in 1997, followed by several attempts to set explicit national targets or limits for road traffic.

Meanwhile, things were happening at the IPCC. The IPCC reports are supposed to summarize the peer reviewed scientific literature on the subjects they cover. But parts of the reports – including the keynote Summary for Policymakers – are approved line by line by government officials. In the 1995/6 report, part of the Summary was reworded in a more alarmist way at the behest of governments. And the technical reports were then updated to match. That is not peer reviewed science!

On now to 2002, and one of the most egregious examples of dishonesty by the UK government in this whole sorry story. That is, their perversion, indeed inversion, of the precautionary principle. Which, at its root, is “Look before you leap,” or even “First, do no harm.”

The Rio Declaration had included a statement (Principle 15) on the precautionary principle. “In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.” Now, I find that idea bizarre. For, if you don’t have a high degree of scientific certainty about the size and

likelihood of a problem, how can you possibly assess whether or not a proposed counter-measure is cost-effective?

But the Interdepartmental Liaison Group on Risk Assessment's 2002 report – Ref [5] – twists this into the following: “The purpose of the precautionary principle is to create an impetus to take a decision notwithstanding scientific uncertainty about the nature and extent of the risk.” “‘Absence of evidence of risk’ should never be confused with, or taken as, ‘evidence of absence of risk.’” And “the burden of proof shifts away from the regulator having to demonstrate potential for harm towards the hazard creator having to demonstrate an acceptable level of safety.”

Do you see what they did there? They abandoned all pretence of presuming us innocent until proven guilty. They said, in effect: “If in doubt, government should act.” So, we are all guilty, until we prove our innocence. That's if they even allow us an opportunity to do that, of course.

Moreover, they have inverted the burden of proof. They demand that we, the accused, must show that everything we are doing is safe. They require us to prove a negative, that we are not causing a problem. Which, in general, is impossible. And even if we're not actually causing any risk at all, they can use the ‘absence of evidence is not evidence of absence’ trick to find us guilty anyway!

In, say, a murder trial, such bad faith ought to lead to immediate dismissal of the case, and prosecution for perverting the course of justice. How much worse, then, is conduct of this kind when our whole human civilization is on the line?

On to 2006, and the Stern Review. This was an (apparent) attempt to provide a cost versus benefits analysis for policy action or inaction on reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. But of the three tools (called integrated assessment models) Stern had available to him, he chose the one which gave by far the most pessimistic estimate of the social cost of CO<sub>2</sub>. He also made other assumptions, which resulted in a grossly

exaggerated estimate of the cost of not taking action. One economist commented: “the Review's radical policy recommendations depend upon controversial extreme assumptions and unconventional discount rates that most mainstream economists would consider much too low.” Again, bad faith by the UK government.

Then, of course, there's the BBC. In 2006, the BBC held a meeting of what they claimed were “the best scientific experts” to decide their policy on climate change reporting. When the list of attendees was eventually unearthed, it included only three scientists; all of them alarmists. It also included the Head of Campaigns for Greenpeace. Not surprisingly, the BBC has continued to maintain a strongly alarmist stance.

More recently (2018), the BBC likened allowing climate change skeptics to speak to “letting someone deny last week's football scores.” Even though their own guidelines say: “We are committed to reflecting a wide range of subject matter and perspectives... so that no significant strand of thought is under-represented or omitted.” In the murder trial analogy, this amounts to denying us the right to speak up in our own defence, and to have our witnesses – including experts – heard at all.

Next, to the 2008 UK climate change bill. They did make a token attempt at a cost benefit analysis. But if I recall right, there was a factor of 7 uncertainty in the costs, and a factor of 12 in the putative “benefits,” of taking action to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in order to mitigate climate change. If we could believe the figures in the first place! Such numbers are useless for making any kind of objective decisions. Yet, the politicians just went ahead anyway, without consulting the people. Bad faith, no?

Before the second reading of that bill, I sent “my” MP (Jeremy Hunt) a nine-page letter, with 20 references. In that letter, I set out the relevant facts as logically as I could. I urged him to fully inform himself on the issue, and, having

done that, to vote against the bill. He never even deigned to acknowledge that letter, let alone respond to it; even when I reminded him almost two years later. And, of course, he voted for the bill. He showed no interest at all in my legitimate concern. That isn't democracy. At the very least, he should have replied: I have passed on your letter to <XXXX>, who is better qualified to answer your questions than I am, and will reply to you within <YYYY> days.

And so, we were forcibly embarked on a never-ending round of green taxes and more green taxes. Of five-year "carbon budgets," a Soviet-style idea both ridiculous and dictatorial. Of energy policies that favour solar and wind, both of which supply power that is far too intermittent ever to be able to generate base load for a Western industrial country. Of idiocies like converting Drax power station to burn wood chips imported from the USA. Of green lies, fabrications, scares and hype; though I myself am now immune to that stuff, having stopped watching TV ten years ago. And of more and more crazy and totalitarian proposals, culminating in this "zero carbon" nonsense.

In 2009, the UK government committed another outrageous dishonesty. Prior to that year, they used – at least in theory – a social cost approach to valuing the effects of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions when considering policies. Though, as the Stern report showed, they were not above fiddling the numbers to suit their own aims.

The government's page on this subject – Ref [6] – says: "The SCC (social cost of carbon) matters because it signals what society should, in theory, be willing to pay now to avoid the future damage caused by incremental carbon emissions." Yes, indeed. A social cost approach is by far the best (indeed, probably the only) basis for objective assessment of the costs of damage against the costs of taking steps to avoid that damage.

But in 2009, the UK government abandoned any attempt or pretence at trying to work out how big the CO<sub>2</sub> problem

really was. As the government's page says: "the new approach will set the valuation of carbon at a level consistent with the UK's short and long-term greenhouse gas emissions targets." Cynically paraphrased, their argument seems to have been: "We know we can't do a credible cost-benefit analysis that justifies any political action on this. But we're already committed to political action. So, we'll make up numbers to match the commitments, and hope that no-one notices."

Abandoning the social cost approach, in my view, was an act of atrociously bad faith. Particularly because more recent research has suggested that when the beneficial side-effects of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, such as increased plant growth, are taken into account, it's possible that the true social cost of these emissions might even become negative. That is, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would become a nett benefit, not a nett cost. If that were so, all arguments for restrictive action on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would be blown right out of the water. And the totalitarians obviously don't want that, do they?

2009 was also the year of the Copenhagen COP meeting. At this meeting, the politicians were aiming to reach binding agreements to keep global temperatures below some completely arbitrary limit. But not long before the meeting, "Climategate" happened.

Climategate was a release of e-mails from a climate research unit at the University of East Anglia. These e-mails showed, to those who bothered to look, that alarmists had interfered with the review and publication process for papers on which the IPCC was supposed to rely. They had dropped, spliced or misrepresented data to produce alarming effects. They had refused to share data to allow others to replicate their work. They had plotted to delete data to evade Freedom of Information requests. They had conspired against journal editors who published skeptical papers. And more. Whatever they were doing, it was neither science nor honest. And so, since taxpayers had paid for them to do honest science, these "climate researchers" were committing fraud against us.

The UK government commissioned no less than three inquiries into Climategate. First, a parliamentary committee, which seemingly chose to avoid the most important questions. Second came the Oxburgh inquiry. It did not interview any critics of the CRU. It claimed that it would assess the quality of CRU's science; but the papers it chose to look at did not cover the controversial areas, and did not address work done for the IPCC. Yet the UK's chief scientist at the time described Oxburgh's inquiry as "a blinder well played." The third review, by Muir Russell, examined the CRU's scientific practices, but not the science itself. It avoided answering the important questions, and the ones it did investigate were largely irrelevant. So, the outcome of all three inquiries was no more than a whitewash. Bad faith, bad faith, bad faith.

In 2015, there was another COP meeting, in Paris. At which, the politicians again sought to reach a binding agreement to keep global temperatures below some completely arbitrary limit. Not that anyone has ever proved beyond reasonable doubt that restrictions on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, large or small, would actually achieve this target or any other. If we don't know what caused the earlier warm periods, how can we know that another warm – or cold – period might not kick in again, without human intervention?

The "limit" touted prior to Paris was 2 degrees Celsius above "pre-industrial levels." (Whatever that means.) But in 2015, it looked, before the El Niño which started in that year, as though global warming had stopped, and was not going to reach 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, or anywhere near it. So, they arbitrarily lowered the limit from 2 degrees to 1.5! That was moving the goalposts, no? Yet another example of extreme bad faith.

### **The mad parliament**

The UK parliament of 2019 showed itself, by its conduct, to be the most atrocious in many centuries. I dub it the mad parliament.

On April 30<sup>th</sup> of that year, minister Michael Gove met with Extinction Rebellion, a green activist group that had been carrying out disruptive protests over the previous several weeks. Later in the year south-east England's anti-terrorist police, in my view rightly, included Extinction Rebellion in a list of extremist organizations; though they were eventually forced to withdraw this. But Extinction Rebellion proved their extremism and destructiveness in February 2020, by digging up a famous lawn at Trinity College, Cambridge – *my* college.

On May 1<sup>st</sup>, the day following that meeting, the parliament declared a “climate emergency.” Without any hard evidence that such an emergency existed, and without even taking a vote.

Interestingly, on May 2<sup>nd</sup> Sky News published the results of a poll – Ref [7] – of a random sample of their subscribers. 56% said they would be unwilling to drive significantly less to protect the environment. And 53% said they would be unwilling even in principle to significantly reduce the amount they fly. Clearly, the politicians had lost the plot, and were completely out of touch with the people they were supposed to be serving.

In June, the government put forward, and the parliament passed, a bill to introduce “a target for at least a 100% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (compared to 1990 levels) in the UK by 2050.” (*At least 100%? Maybe more? Crazy*). Select committees also initiated a scheme of “citizens’ climate assemblies,” one of the demands put forward by Extinction Rebellion. It’s amazing that those who are supposed to be serving the people kow-towed to a disruptive extremist group, but never even bothered to ask us the people what we thought. What a bunch of con artists.

Where did all this panic come from? A report – Ref [8] – was published in May by the Committee for Climate Change (CCC). This report recommended “a new emissions target for the UK: net-zero greenhouse gases by 2050.”

Now, the CCC is supposed to be an independent and impartial advisory body. But in my view, it's about as impartial as Extinction Rebellion. There are mugshots and bios of eight CCC members at the beginning of the report. There may well be conflicts of interest for several of them between their outside careers and investments, and being on a supposedly independent advisory board. And when you supplement the bios with a few morsels from Wikipedia, they tell a story. I'll let you, my readers, fill in the details for yourselves; but I will point out that one of the eight is an economist called Paul Johnson. Johnson was one of the reviewers of the 2009 decision to abandon the use of the social cost of carbon. And he supported that change.

One upshot of the bill was a report – Ref [9] – published last November by five UK universities, using the collective moniker “UK FIRES.” I confess that when I first found out about this, if I hadn't been given the link by a reputable source, I would have thought it was just a sick joke. But sadly, it's real. And, after just a single pass through the diagram summarizing the proposals, I could see that the whole idea is a nightmare. The proposals read like the edicts of a crazed, ultra-conservative dictator; and they make Soviet five-year plans look like a cake-walk. In analogy to Mao Tse-Tung's genocidal Great Leap Forward, I dubbed them the Great Leap Backward. And the ideas in the more recent “setting the challenge” document, to which I am responding, are just more of the same.

But this parliament was crazed in more ways than just seeking to destroy our economy and our freedoms for the sake of nothing more than a pack of green falsehoods. They tried to stop Brexit, several times. This went against David Cameron's written promise that the government would honour the result of the Brexit referendum. They tried to stop a newly appointed prime minister discharging promises which he had made to the people. And they even tried to prevent him calling a general election in order to resolve the situation.

## **Species extinction**

The mention of Extinction Rebellion calls to mind one of the two other issues from *Our Common Future* which are still active. Namely, species loss.

No-one knows for sure just how many different species there are on planet Earth. The best estimate I could find was 8.7 million multi-cellular species. What this means is that the claim that species extinction is a real problem can only be justified by reference to examples of particular species, which humans have extinguished. Further, any species that was killed off by humans must have been killed off by one or more individuals or groups of humans.

Now, my view is that, if there is a problem for which I am not responsible in any way, I have no responsibility to do anything about it; on the same basis that innocent people should not be punished for crimes they did not commit. So, my demand to environmentalists is: Name and describe a species to whose extinction I contributed, and say what I did, and approximately when, to contribute to the extinction. I've never had an answer from even a single one of them!

## **Air pollution**

Since cars are the major subject of this consultation, I'll end this chapter with a brief mention of the other issue which green activists have been trying to use to force us out of our cars. Namely, air pollution. Here, as with climate change, there is a sordid backstory. I cover that backstory in the talk I linked to at Ref [4]. There is a (slightly earlier) written version of the talk at Ref [10]. Of particular note are the commitments to the UN's Gothenburg protocol in 1999 and 2012, and the EU emissions limits set in 2016.

## 4. Some numbers

Next, I'll chuck around a few numbers. Danger: (former) mathematician at work! Here are some headline numbers I worked out:

1. If all use of fossil fuels in the UK ended immediately, the amount of global warming avoided by 2100 would be less than 0.014 degrees Celsius.
2. I calculated the social cost of all UK CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, as at 2050, to be of the order of £26 (optimistic) or £164 (pessimistic) per head per year. For emissions from UK cars, the social cost comes to between £9.20 and £60 per driver per year. I could be out by an order of magnitude, of course. Either way! But to kill our lifestyles and freedoms, for the sake of avoiding damage costing only £9.20 per driver per year, or even £60, would be lunacy.
3. An average UK driver, doing 10,000 miles per year, already pays over £300 per year in CO<sub>2</sub> taxes on fuel alone. This is way more than even the high end of the social costs I worked out for emissions from UK cars.

The numerically daunted may prefer to go to the start of the next chapter at this point.

### Effects of eliminating fossil fuels

A recent model experiment, reported at Ref [11], showed that “complete elimination of all fossil fuels in the US immediately would only restrict any increase in world temperature by less than one tenth of one degree Celsius by 2050, and by less than one fifth of one degree Celsius by 2100.”

I'll scale that back to the UK, whose CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2017 were about one-fourteenth of US emissions. The amount of warming avoided by ending fossil fuel use in the UK immediately would be less than 0.007 degrees Celsius by 2050, 0.014 degrees by 2100. No-one in the world would even notice that. And the green wreckers think it's worth-

while to kill the lifestyles and freedoms of movement and choice of everyone in the UK for the sake of 0.014 degrees Celsius? Even if everyone in the entire world were to stop using fossil fuels immediately (and the Chinese and the Indians, to name just two, won't ever do that), the difference would be less than 1.3 degrees. Not worth worrying about.

On top of that, UK emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> have already gone down by 42% since 1990. Isn't that enough? Given the sacrifices we've already made for that, and the sacrifices we're all still making over COVID, isn't it time to draw a line? Isn't it time to say: enough is enough of this crap, let's get on with our lives?

### **The social cost of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions**

The politicians have stitched up any possibility of an "official" social cost figure for UK CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. But that doesn't stop scientists trying to work out the "social cost of carbon." Nor does it stop people like me doing back-of-the-envelope calculations, based on their work.

A few months ago, I made some calculations from a 2017 paper, whose lead author was Kevin Dayaratna. He also did the experiment I told you about above. They did two estimates using different integrated assessment models. The optimistic estimate took into account benefits from having more CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, such as increased plant growth; the pessimistic one did not.

The optimistic estimate came out with a social cost of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, as at 2050, of US\$5.09 per ton. The pessimistic one came out with US\$32.51 per ton. I cranked the calculator handle, and converted these to social costs of (all) UK CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as at 2050. They came out to £26 and £164 per head per year, respectively.

According to the Guardian, cars currently account for 18% of UK CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This puts the social cost of emissions from cars between £4.60 and £30 per head per year. Since almost exactly half of the UK population are car

drivers, this puts the social cost somewhere between £9.20 and £60 per driver per year.

In contrast, can we quantify how much benefit cars provide to their drivers and passengers? In 2017, the Daily Express calculated the lifetime cost of running a car in the UK as £169,000. Over 50 years of driving, that's almost £3,400 per year. That doesn't include the capital costs of buying the car in the first place – for a £12,000 car which lasts 8 years, that's another £1,500 per year. Thus, car owners in the UK are each shelling out every year around £5,000 on average. So, their subjective perception of the benefit from their cars must be at least that large!

Anyone that wants to take away that benefit, or even to restrict it, has to put forward a very strong case. Don't they?

### **How much do we already pay in CO<sub>2</sub> taxes?**

So, how much are we already paying in CO<sub>2</sub> taxation? According to Energy Systems Catapult, reported at Ref [12], UK motorists are already paying “carbon taxes” of around £109 per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>. A ton of CO<sub>2</sub> is produced from approximately 433 litres of petrol or 373 litres of diesel. So, these taxes amount to about 25.2p and 29.2p a litre for petrol and diesel respectively.

Petrol cars in the UK average about 36mpg (7.92 miles per litre) and diesels 43mpg (9.46 miles per litre). An average driver, doing 10,000 miles a year, would buy about 1,260 litres of petrol or 1,060 litres of diesel in a year; so, paying around £318 or £309 respectively in CO<sub>2</sub> taxes. And that doesn't even include vehicle excise duty, which also is based on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and can go up to £580 a year.

So, motorists are *already* paying way more than the social costs of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from our cars. We're actually paying way more than the social cost of *all* UK CO<sub>2</sub> emissions! It's no wonder the establishment don't want ordinary people to see the social cost numbers.

## 5. Transport options in the UK

In this chapter, I'll look at some of the transport options in the UK. Much of my assessment will be subjective, based on my own personal situation. For every human being is different; physically, mentally, and in our transport needs and desires. That is why the maximum choice of transport options must always be open to everyone.

### The car

The car is a blessing to humanity. Many people would not be able to travel easily between home and work without a car. Parts of ordinary life like shopping would be far more difficult and time-consuming. Many social and recreational trips would be impossible, or not worth doing, without a car.

As an environment for the human beings who use them, cars are vastly superior to other means of transport. For your car takes you, in comfort and privacy, directly from the start of your journey to your destination. It goes when *you* are ready to go. It keeps you dry and warm. The car can take loads quite easily; including loads you couldn't easily carry on your own. And parents can most easily take their children wherever they need to go by car. No wonder people are willing to pay good money to drive cars – *their* cars, over which they have personal or familial control.

But for more than 25 years now, we car drivers have been targeted by a political movement that is hostile to us. We have been subjected to creeping speed limits, cameras to catch us out, junctions re-designed to reduce traffic flow, road narrowing and closures, speed bumps, bus lanes, cycle tracks, chicanes and more. Fuel taxes have been used for decades to milk maximum revenue out of us. And those, who need to drive into big cities like London, get charged huge sums of money for it. The support of these policies by all the mainstream political parties means that the ordinary people of the UK are denied any say in or influence on these policies. This is not acceptable in a democracy.

As to my own situation: I am 67 and single. I live on the outskirts of a town of 20,000 or so. My home is about 170 feet vertically above the town, and two of the three routes between them are very steep; the third is both longer and trafficky. Both the town shops (1¼ miles away) and the smaller shops in the village (¾ mile) are down in the valley.

I still work when the opportunities are there; and much of my paid work, if I can't do it at home, I do in an office about 8 miles away, across country. My main social hobby is playing the tuba (a 25-pound hunk of metal, which though it has a soft case with handles, is very awkward to carry any distance) with a brass band based about 20 miles away.

If I couldn't drive a car any more, I would lose my band friends. I couldn't even get the tuba to and from a local railway station without a taxi. And the band's rehearsal hall is more than a mile from the station at that end; and there are no evening buses. Moreover, trips to my favourite countryside outside the immediate area would be impossible. I would, in essence, be trapped in a Gulag.

I suspect that many millions of people in the UK, old and young, will feel the same way, once they fully understand what the effects of these proposals would be on them. Even though the details, of which parts of your life would become no longer liveable, will be different in each case.

It is a very serious violation of our human rights to take away our freedom of movement and freedom of choice on the basis of allegations, made by extremists, that aren't even proven. This is not "transforming" lives, as those pushing "zero carbon" and its spin-offs try to make out. This is *killing* our lifestyles and our freedoms. I will never forgive anyone that has promoted or supported these policies.

### **Buses**

Bus service near my home is sparse and not convenient. It is 20 minutes' walk to the nearest bus stop with a half decent service. And that, too, is down in the valley.

Like all public transport, the bus goes according to a schedule set by someone else, which probably doesn't suit you. And the routes tend to be mostly radial, meaning that if your journey is "across the grain" you have to change once or even twice. For example, to get to my sometime workplace 8 miles away, it takes 18 minutes each way by car. By bus, it takes around two hours each way, with two changes, and I have to leave the office well before 5pm if I am to catch the last bus up the hill home.

Buses are slow, and many are uncomfortable. Moreover, you have to hang around waiting for the bus, at a cold and draughty bus stop, or unprotected in the pouring rain. And you're often worrying that it will be late, or won't arrive at all. Moreover, buses, like other public transport, are breeding-grounds for infection. Even if bus services in my area were improved by orders of magnitude, buses could still not meet my particular transport needs.

### **Trains**

For decades, I have used the train as my means of transport for journeys for which the car isn't workable (such as into and out of central London). I also use the train sometimes for day leisure trips at week-ends, since this is less effort than driving. But because of the hub-and-spoke nature of the rail network, the range of easily accessible destinations is limited.

The train is usually fast, but is unreliable. It is vulnerable to industrial action, as well as to engineering works. It is expensive for what it is. It can be crowded, which I hate; and sometimes you can't even get a seat at all. And the standard of comfort varies enormously from train company to train company and line to line, and even between different stock on the same service.

While the train is of some utility to me, it can't meet my transport needs on its own. And bus connections at stations often don't run at the times of day I need to travel.

## **Air travel**

I love flying; though I can't afford it any more. Air travel moves people around the world for both business and leisure, and makes time critical and long-distance trade possible. It's a primary vehicle of human progress today. For me, anyone that wants to restrict or ban air travel is an enemy of our civilization.

## **Cycling and walking**

The bicycle, in its place, is a fine means of transport. It has some of the same convenience advantages as the car. It is healthy. It is quick over very short distances. It is an excellent means of recreational travel, going fast enough to get from place to place, yet slowly enough to let you enjoy what lies between. I know all this, because I once went coast-to-coast across North America by bicycle.

But the bicycle has its problems too. Cycling is unpleasant in the wet. It does not work in snow or ice. It does not work when you are injured, or feeling below your best. Longer journeys can simply take too long. Regular journeys become a boring grind. And, as people get older and their bodies stiffer, bicycling becomes less and less attractive. The bicycle can never be a substitute for the car. Particularly for a 67-year-old, who lives at the top of a hill.

Walking, too, can be fun. I once walked, in 18 days, around the coast from Calais to le Havre. And I still walk a lot, compared with most people of my age.

But walking is a slow way to get around. The day's range is short. And as with the bicycle, walking becomes harder, and slower, as you get older. To claim that there's a "health benefit" from forcing people to walk, when another means of transport – such as the car – fits their needs better, is dishonest.

## **6. Indictments, diagnosis and cure**

When you piece together the story of what the green wreckers and their cronies have done to us, as I have done in this pamphlet, I expect you will go through several emotions. You will be amazed at the arrogance with which they have behaved. You will be horrified by how often, how badly, and for how long, they have lied to you and misled you. You will be angry at how those, that are supposed to represent you and serve you, have persistently acted against your interests. You will understand that they are not your friends, but your enemies. And you will want to join with other like-minded people to fight back against them.

Here are some of the things they have done to us over “climate change” and other environmental issues. I have divided the list into two parts: one for the UK government, and one for the activists, media, pseudo “scientists” and other hangers-on. It’s not nice reading.

### **Indictments against the UK government**

1. They failed to explain clearly to the people just what the adverse consequences to them would be, if the UK signed up to the Rio agreements in 1992.
2. They signed up to the Rio agreements without holding a referendum, which should have been mandatory before any commitment of that magnitude could be made.
3. They accepted, even if they did not actually demand, that the 1995/6 IPCC report should be presented in a more alarmist way than was warranted by the science.
4. They have persistently sought to impose collective targets and limits on what people may do. Such targets and limits are unjust and tyrannical, and should never be imposed in any civilized country, least of all in a democracy.
5. They have committed to third parties, the UN and the EU, that they will enforce these unjust, tyrannical limits.

6. Further, they have on several occasions moved the goalposts by arbitrarily tightening these limits.
7. They have perverted the precautionary principle, from its true form “Look before you leap,” into a general presumption that if there is doubt over a risk, government should act. In the process, they have negated the presumption of innocence, inverted the burden of proof, and required the accused to prove a negative.
8. They accepted and acted on the Stern Review in 2006, despite its use of the most pessimistic of the available assessment models, and despite economists’ criticisms that its policy recommendations depended on controversial and extreme assumptions.
9. They passed the 2008 climate change act without holding a referendum, which should have been mandatory before any commitment of that magnitude could be made.
10. They have made, on many occasions, very costly commitments on behalf of the people they are supposed to represent, without any rigorous justification.
11. They have promoted electricity from green energy sources, which (as they ought to have known) are not adequate to provide reliable power for a Western industrial civilization, because they must be backed up by conventional power sources.
12. They abandoned the social cost approach to cost-benefit analysis on issues involving carbon dioxide emissions. In consequence, since 2009 they have not even attempted cost versus benefit assessments on issues involving CO<sub>2</sub>.
13. All three of their 2010 inquiries into the Climategate scandal whitewashed the matter.
14. They signed up to the 2015 Paris agreement without holding a referendum, which should have been mandatory before any commitment of that magnitude could be made.

- 15.They allowed in 2019 an extremist and arguably terrorist green group to dictate government policy.
- 16.The parliament in 2019 declared a “climate emergency” without any evidence, and without even a vote.
- 17.They committed in 2019 to a “zero carbon” target by 2050; requiring extensive and draconian measures which clearly are against the interests of the people. The proposals have very high costs, both economic and in freedom, and offer no or almost no proven benefits.
- 18.Neither their plans for implementing “zero carbon,” nor the consequences to the people affected by them, have been thought through.
- 19.They have failed to implement a prototype scheme to prove that a zero-carbon economy would actually be sustainable.
- 20.They have allowed climate policies to be driven by a “Committee for Climate Change,” which does not represent the interests of the people, and is neither independent nor impartial.
- 21.They have repeatedly acted in bad faith towards the people they are supposed to be serving. Their attitude is arrogant, insincere and insensitive, and they lack concern for the bad consequences of their policies on the people.
- 22.They seek further to restrict the activities of drivers who are already paying far more in carbon taxes than the best estimated social cost of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from their cars.

### **Indictments against activists, media and academe**

- 23.They have persistently misrepresented what the “climate change” allegations actually are.
- 24.They have been unwilling to enter into fair and open debate with skeptics of the “climate change” allegations.
- 25.They label skeptics with nasty names like “denier” or “flat earther.”

- 26.They have attempted, and are attempting, to suppress skeptical views.
- 27.They have shown ungratefulness and even hatred towards human industrial civilization, which has given so much to all of us – including them.
- 28.They show hatred for the free market economy; the only environment in which human beings, at our present stage of development, can flourish to the full potential of each.
- 29.The mainstream media, with only a few exceptions, are biased towards the alarmist side.
- 30.The BBC have allowed their policy on climate change reporting to be dictated by activists.
- 31.The BBC have violated their own charter by denying fair time to the skeptical side.
- 32.“Scientists” have sought to interfere with the review and publication process for scientific papers.
- 33.They have fudged, or dropped, data in order to produce an alarming effect.
- 34.They have refused to share their data for the purpose of replicating their work, an essential part of science.
- 35.They have conspired to delete data in order to avoid Freedom of Information requests.
- 36.They have conspired to get sacked at least one journal editor who published skeptical papers.
- 37.They have used taxpayers’ money, which had been paid to them to do science, for purposes which were not science.
- 38.Taxpayer-funded universities have created pie-in-the-sky plans for “zero carbon” that, if put into effect, would cause huge damage to the people who paid for them.

## What went wrong?

To get an idea of how this mess all came about, I'm going to *détour* into one of my "hobby" areas: political philosophy.

The "Westphalian" system of nation-states, under which we suffer today, was devised by a monarchist Frenchman called Jean Bodin in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and introduced in the 17<sup>th</sup>. It is still the basis of political organization in most places in the world today. (Even the EU is, in effect, a state). A state differs from other organizations, in that it claims "sovereignty" over a geographical territory, and over the people in it. Sovereignty means supreme power; and it is exercised by a sovereign.

In Bodin's scheme, the sovereign – the king or ruling *élite* – is fundamentally different from, and superior to, the rest of the population in its territory, the "subjects." In particular, it has moral privileges; that is, rights to do certain things, which others don't share. Bodin lists these privileges as: To make laws to bind the subjects. To make war and peace. To appoint the top officials of the state. To be the final court of appeal. To pardon guilty individuals if it so wishes. To issue a currency. To levy taxes and impositions, and to exempt, if it wishes, certain individuals or groups from payment.

Furthermore, the sovereign isn't bound by the laws it makes. And it isn't responsible for the consequences of what it does (also known as "the king can do no wrong.") Because of this, sovereignty is incompatible with the rule of law.

But we're still using this "Westphalian" system today. Isn't that crazy? We don't use 17<sup>th</sup> century medicine any more, or 17<sup>th</sup> century technology, or 17<sup>th</sup> century transport. And we've been through the Enlightenment since then, for goodness' sake! So why are we still using a political system from the days of the divine right of kings? Why are we still suffering a system that lets an *élite* do to us exactly what it wants, with almost no accountability or come-back?

In the UK, it isn't at all clear where this "sovereignty" actually lies. It started out with the monarch – the king or queen. Today, it is supposedly wielded by a legal concoction called "the crown in parliament." But the parliament – and the House of Commons, in particular – acts as if it was the sovereign, and Silly Lizzie the not-so-poor old monarch just has to like it or lump it. That means that people in the UK are subjected to the rule of that mad parliament, which last year did all the atrocious things I listed above. And the 2020 version doesn't seem to be much, if any, better.

Ah, you may say, but *we* elected them! Doesn't democracy enable us to elect representatives to defend our interests? Doesn't it give us all a fair say in every decision?

Well, for a start, *I* didn't elect them. After 32 years as a conscientious non-voter, I was all set up to vote for my local Brexit party candidate; because Brexit is an absolute essential before we can even start to solve the bigger problems, such as green policies. But he was withdrawn, and decided not to stand as an independent. And none of the others were worth voting for; certainly not Jeremy Hunt!

But the deeper problem is that all the mainstream parties, and so the parliament too, are far too full of the same kinds of people. They are usually glib and charming. But underneath, they are arrogant, and think they are superior to others. They often lie, or are dishonest, manipulative or hypocritical. They often behave with bad faith. They tend to lack empathy and regard for other people. They show little concern for the human individual, or for losses or suffering they cause to others. They seek to deny responsibility for, and to evade accountability for, their actions. They are untrustworthy, often impatient, and sometimes rash or reckless. You know the type: they are *politicians*.

Now, those characteristics I just listed are more than a few of the features that distinguish a psychopath. And psychopaths aren't nice people. It's generally reckoned that about 20 per cent of prison inmates are psychopaths. And

that psychopaths are responsible for over 50 per cent of violent crimes. Moreover, put enough of these types in one place, and they will get scheming together. And before you know it, you'll be faced with a criminal gang. Or worse, a political party.

Political power attracts psychopaths. They can indulge their fantasies, hurt people they don't like, and enjoy praise from those they do favours for. All on the taxpayers' dime, and without much chance of being caught. This applies at lower levels than the parliament, too; for example, to bureaucrats and jobsworths. And it's a self-reinforcing process. For, as Lord Acton identified, power corrupts. First, power attracts the corrupt; then it corrupts them further. Thus, power and corruption go hand in hand. At the same time, democracy opens opportunities for power, up to the highest levels, to anyone with the right skills to get elected – like glibness, dishonesty, manipulateness.

There is a third factor, too. This factor is a way of thinking, which over the last 50 years or so has taken root in universities. But it has also spread among other establishment intellectuals, such as in the media. Its name is post-modernism.

Post-modernism denies the existence of objective reality and objective truth. Instead, it claims that these things can only be relative to a culture. It denies any basis on which to build up knowledge, and rejects as totalitarian any attempts to systematize knowledge. It denies that there are any objective moral values. It denies that reason and logic, science and technology, business and industry are tools to better the human condition. Instead, it paints them as instruments of oppression and destruction. And it denies that there is such a thing as human nature, independent of culture. Instead, it sees individuals as formed and moulded by the society they happen to live in.

The dogma of post-modernism lies at the root of the extreme green world-view. It denies that humans are special,

and capable of far more than mere animals. And it denies that the Earth is *our* planet, and that its resources are there for us to use wisely in order to build our civilizations.

Amazing, isn't it? This is a mind-set that opposes, in almost every respect, the Enlightenment values which underpin our Western civilization. The Enlightenment gave us a bottom-up view of the world; in which truth, right conduct as is natural to us, and the human individual are prime values. In contrast, post-modernism is a top-down view. Political power is the prime value. Legislation, made by those in power, trumps our innate notions of right and wrong. And the politically correct narrative of the day overpowers any conceivable truth.

This triple whammy of an outdated political system that allows all but unbridled power, elections that too easily allow the worst into power, and a top-down world-view among intellectuals, is, I think, at the root of our troubles. For me, it explains the creeping totalitarianism, creeping corruption and creeping centralization, which have been so characteristic of politics in the last 50 years or so.

### **What is to be done?**

Just as they were for him, these words of Lenin – no less! – are for us a key question. How do we make government work for the benefit of good people, instead of harming us and oppressing us? And how do we re-claim our rights and freedoms, including our right to private transport?

We could try a *gilets jaunes* style approach to the problem – civil disobedience. This can have some effect in the short term, as witness the fuel price protests of September 2000. But our enemies, after any setback, always re-group and come on even stronger. Besides which, yellow jackets aren't my personal style. I won't stop you trying it if you want to; but I don't think it attacks the root of the problem.

We could form a Car Drivers' Party, and seek electoral success. I don't like that idea, for several reasons. It's a huge

organizational task, and needs money and time we haven't got. But most of all, it's trying to play our enemies at their own game. That is never a good strategy.

My own preference is not for a political movement, but a moral one. I think we need an ethical crusade, to save our Western industrial civilization. We need to dump the dishonest. We need to dump the green wreckers and their cronies. And we must aim to knock our enemies down so hard, that they cannot recover. Not by beating them at the ballot box, but by discrediting them in the minds of the general public.

One strand of this, I think, must be to restore the human species to its rightful place. We must recognize that we are not merely custodians of our planet; but that it is our job to make it into a beautiful home and garden, fit for a civilized species. And that the Earth's resources – animal, vegetable, mineral – are there for us to use wisely, in order to fulfil our potential; the human potential.

Another strand is to bring out of the closet, to dust off and to re-promote the ideas of the Enlightenment. We must polish up values like objective truth and honest science. We must promote respect for every human individual worthy of the name, and for his or her rights. We must institute the rule of law and justice, in place of the rule of bad legislation made by corrupt, dishonest politicians. And we must rekindle in people's minds the spirit of human progress, which our enemies have been suppressing for so long.

A third strand is to help people identify, with clarity, their friends and their enemies. What distinguishes a friend from an enemy is not skin colour, or received religion, or place of birth or residence, or age, gender or sexual preferences. What matters are only their actions, and their intent towards others. Those who behave as civilized human beings – who are peaceful and honest, and respect the rights of all those who respect their equal rights – are your friends. Those that fail to measure up to civilized human standards – for

example the aggressive, the dishonest, and those that violate your or others' rights – are your enemies.

The fourth strand is raising public awareness of the atrocity of our enemies' behaviours. We must show up their arrogance, their lies, their dishonesty, their bad faith, their lack of empathy and concern. We must make it amply clear that civilized human beings do not behave in such ways. And that those, that do behave in such ways, are not fit to be accepted into any community of civilized human beings.

Ask yourself: Why should honest people care about the dishonest? Why should the victims of bad political policies care about those that promoted, made, supported or enforced those policies? Why should you excuse or forgive those that have intentionally and dishonestly wronged you? You owe your enemies no more compassion or concern than they have showed for you.

We need to get people – lots of people – at first horrified, then angry, then incensed, at what has been and is being done to them. We want people to feel contempt and loathing for the green extremists, for their followers, and for the politicians, bureaucrats, academics, media and others that jumped on their bandwagon. We want good people to call out our enemies' bad acts as they happen, and to lead the chorus of derisive laughter when they suffer reverses.

And in return for all the scares and hype they have bombarded us with for so long, we will give our enemies something that should *really* scare them. That is, the bill for compensation for their share of the damage, which their agendas and machinations have caused to innocent people.

Once we're finally rid of them... won't the world be a far better place for us human beings than it is today?

## 7. Comments on “setting the challenge”

In this chapter, I give some specific comments on the “setting the challenge” document at Ref [1]. Quotes from the document are in **bold**, and my comments in normal font.

To me, the whole thing comes over as pie in the sky. Neither the plans, nor their consequences to the people affected by them, have been thought through. The “zero carbon” idea has not been properly costed. No cost versus benefit analysis has been published, and the abandoning of the social cost approach in 2009 will have made an honest analysis impossible under current rules. There is no explanation of where the money will come from for all the huge infrastructure investments they are proposing. Further, no attempt has been made to create a prototype “zero carbon” economy, to establish whether or not it would actually be sustainable.

Moreover, the document gives a strong impression that the strategic decisions are already made. And so, that this consultation is no more than a box-ticking exercise, and responding to it is a waste of time, except for those that favour even more draconian action. I can only anticipate that the responses to it from those like me, who are strongly and deeply opposed to government setting any kind of arbitrary collective targets and limits on what people may do, will very likely be ignored. That, in itself, would be seriously bad faith, over and above all the other instances of bad faith the UK government has already shown over this matter.

There is also an arrogance that comes over very clearly, with phrases like “interventions,” “behaviour change,” and “accelerating modal shift” used repeatedly. I will remind you once more that in a democracy, government is supposed to serve the people, and to serve every individual person; not merely to rule over us.

Here are some comments on specific statements in the document.

### **Climate change is the most pressing environmental challenge of our time. (page 3)**

No. For me, the most pressing challenge of our time is habitat destruction. I don't mean habitat for birds, or bees, or newts; I mean *our* habitat, the human habitat.

By human habitat, I mean a combination of: (1) The free market economy. (2) A just, honest government, dedicated to serving every individual among the governed, not to the ideology or politics of any faction. (3) Maximum individual freedom, consistent with living in a civilized community. This habitat is the best – indeed, the only – environment in which human beings, at our present stage of development, can flourish to the full potential of each. But these proposals aim to damage, and in time to destroy, our habitat.

### **There is overwhelming scientific evidence that we need to take action. (page 3)**

If you have overwhelming scientific evidence leading to the conclusion that the costs of human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are exceeding, or credibly will exceed, the benefits we receive from the actions which cause those emissions, show it! Produce evidence from, say, a hundred locations across the globe, each showing and quantifying damage that has been done to people or property. And, in each case, supply proof, beyond reasonable doubt, that human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> were the cause of all, or some specified part, of that damage. And that the damage caused was greater than the benefits humans obtained from the activities which generated those emissions.

I have been searching, for 12 years now, for objective, incontrovertible evidence that proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are causing, or will cause, nett damage to our human civilization or to our planet. I have not found any. If you have such evidence, then publish it, let the skeptics respond, and let both sides debate the issue freely and fully, in a forum accessible to the

general public, under impartial moderation, and reported without bias in the media.

**The UK will be an internationally recognised leader in environmentally sustainable, low-carbon technology and innovation in transport. (page 3)**

More likely, I think, the UK government will become an international laughing-stock. The climate of thought, among those who seek truth, is already moving towards increased skepticism about the global warming allegations. Honest environmentalists are already starting to desert the sinking ship of climate change alarmism. Patrick Moore, one of the co-founders of Greenpeace, and Michael Shellenberger whom I mentioned in my Preface, are two examples.

I'll give another cautionary tale from the past. In the 1920s, there was much interest in airships. They were then seen as the long-distance transport of the future. The UK government commissioned two airships, R100 and R101. R100 was built by private industry, and made a successful return trip to Canada in 1930. R101, built by the government, crashed on its maiden overseas flight in October of that year, killing almost all aboard. An earlier airship, the Navy's R38, had also crashed with the loss of almost all its crew. This shows that the UK government doesn't have a good track record at backing winners in transport policy.

**...this plan - to make our towns and cities better places to live... (page 5)**

I notice that the document doesn't mention either of the words, "suburbs" or "countryside." It is the people who live in those places who will suffer worst from the proposals. Why should these people lose their powered mobility – which they need *more* than town and city dwellers do, not less – for the sake of nothing more than some (highly dubious) air quality benefit, that only accrues to town and city dwellers?

**...difficult decisions to be made... driven by shifting public attitudes and behavioural changes. (page 10)**

How arrogant, to expect “shifting public attitudes and behavioural changes” from people who don’t even believe in the cause they are being told to make sacrifices for!

And even more so, for people like me, who have looked in depth at the facts and the history of the matter, and concluded that the whole foofaraw is a scam. You will never get me to shift my attitude, or voluntarily to change any of my behaviour, unless you first deal with me in absolute good faith, and tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is you, politicians and government, that are the ones that need to make behavioural changes, not me!

**Figure 6 (page 14)**

A very shallow comparison. You ought to compare all emissions throughout all the processes involved – e.g. emissions from generating electricity to power trains or electric cars – to gain a fairer picture. Which, I suspect, would be very different from the one presented. Full life cycle emissions, from construction of equipment through to disposal, should also be considered.

**87% of car users in England are of the view that their current lifestyle means they need to own a car (page 17)**

There are 33.6 million car drivers in the UK; 70% of the electorate of about 47.8 million. So, 61% of the electorate need a car. If the UK truly was a democracy, there would not even be talk of any restrictions or bans on cars.

**...measures will be introduced to address declining bus usage across the country (page 24)**

If bus usage is declining, that means buses are failing to meet people’s needs. It’s extremely high-handed to talk of “introducing measures,” when the sane first step is to find

out the causes of the problem. Something which bus operators ought to be doing anyway, to see what they might do to offer a better service.

**...we will need to go further than the existing plans set out in this document (page 58)**

This statement is an explicit admission that the whole idea of a “zero carbon” target hasn’t been thought through. It also directly contradicts the ministerial statement on page 3, that the document “gives a clear view of where we are today and the size of emissions reduction we need.” Incompetence, if not also bad faith.

All action on the “zero carbon” schemes should be halted, pending a full, independent audit into the government’s handling of the whole matter of carbon dioxide emissions. This audit should be objective, critical, unbiased and non-political. It should include accurate and honest assessments of the social costs of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which would result with or without a range of possible reduction actions. And it should quantify the corresponding “benefits” (positive or negative) of these reduction actions to people in different parts of the UK.

**We are already exploring how we can use vehicles differently, such as through shared mobility. (page 60)**

Assuming that by “shared mobility” you mean single or return journey car rentals on demand, this is worth considering. As long as solutions are developed in the free market, not imposed by government.

## **8. My response to the consultation**

The consultation asked for replies under five headings, as listed below. Here are my direct responses.

### **The phase out date**

There must be no phase out date. People must be free to choose whatever form or forms of transport best suit them and their circumstances.

### **The definition of what should be phased out**

Nothing should be phased out.

### **Barriers to achieving the proposals**

There are no barriers to achieving my proposals, other than a clique of activists, dishonest politicians and other vested interests that are seeking to hobble, and in time to destroy, our Western industrial civilization.

### **The impact of these proposals**

My proposals will be beneficial to everyone, except the deep green vested interests and their political, corporate, academic, media, bureaucrat and activist cronies. Those responsible for the “zero carbon” much-ado-about-nothing, and those that have lied to or misled the public over this issue, deserve to be brought to justice, and forced to take part in an experiment to find out whether or not a zero-carbon economy is sustainable in the long term.

### **What measures are required**

Here are ten measures, which between them could start to solve the “climate change” problem.

1. The UK government must revoke all commitments to the green agenda. It must repeal the Climate Change Act 2008 and all legislation derived from it. It must withdraw from the Paris agreement, on the grounds that the commitments made had not been rigorously cost-

justified, and that the consent of the people had not been given, or even sought. And it must withdraw from the Rio agreements, Gothenburg protocol and all other international environmental treaties, pending objective reviews on all the issues.

2. The UK must return to the “social cost” approach for cost versus benefit analysis in environmental matters, that was used in theory (but was not applied rigorously) prior to 2009. It must perform accurate, objective and unbiased social cost estimations and cost versus benefit analyses on all environmental issues in the future.
3. The government must adopt a “polluter pays compensation” principle. That is, those who cause a negative externality to others should be required to pay the proportion of the social cost of the nuisance for which they are responsible. And these payments should be routed to the victims of the nuisance, each in proportion to the harms they have suffered.
4. In parallel with “polluter pays compensation,” the government must also adopt a “politicker pays compensation” principle. That is, where environmental or other political policies have unjustly caused damage to anyone, those that promoted, made, supported or enforced those policies must be made to compensate the victims of that damage. This principle should be retrospectively applicable to “climate change.”
5. The UK government must repudiate the perversion of the precautionary principle, that was made in 2002 by the Inter-departmental Liaison Group on Risk Assessment. It must always respect the true meaning of the precautionary principle: “Look before you leap.” If the case for a government action that will harm innocent people is not proven, that action must not be taken.
6. The UK government must commission a thorough, independent, scrupulously honest, unbiased audit of its own conduct, and the conduct of those it funded, in

environmental matters over the period since 1970. This audit should be objective, critical, impartial and non-political. It should include accurate and honest assessments of the social costs of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which would result with or without a range of possible reduction actions. And it should quantify the corresponding “benefits” (positive or negative) of these reduction actions to people in different parts of the UK.

7. The audit should lead to prosecutions against those that have defrauded taxpayers, or acted against the interests of taxpayers, on any of these matters. Both compensation to the victims and, where appropriate, additional criminal punishments should be considered.
8. Further, individuals and institutions that have lied to or misled the public, or attempted to hide or obfuscate the truth, on environmental matters should be removed from all positions of power or influence, and denied all future government funding. Anyone that has behaved in bad faith towards the public on these issues must be barred for life from any government employment or funding.
9. The UK government must develop sane and sensible energy policies for the future, justified by maximum benefits versus costs to consumers. In the meantime, the UK must return to using energy sources proven to be successful at powering a Western industrial civilization, such as gas, nuclear, and coal (with scrubbers). Solar power should be de-emphasized except for off-grid applications, and consideration should be given to abandoning wind power altogether.
10. The UK government must adopt transport policies which allow each individual to use those means of transport which they find most appropriate to their own circumstances. It must not favour one means of transport over another (e.g. through regulations or subsidies), and it must allow free competition between different transport modes in order to meet public demand.

## References

---

[<sup>1</sup>] Department for Transport, March 2020: Consulting on ending the sale of new petrol, diesel and hybrid cars and vans.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/consulting-on-ending-the-sale-of-new-petrol-diesel-and-hybrid-cars-and-vans/consulting-on-ending-the-sale-of-new-petrol-diesel-and-hybrid-cars-and-vans>

[<sup>2</sup>] Thomson Reuters Foundation, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020: One in five UK children report nightmares about climate change.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/climate-change-children/one-in-five-uk-children-report-nightmares-about-climate-change-idUSL1N2AV1FF>

[<sup>3</sup>] Michael Shellenberger, June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2020: On Behalf Of Environmentalists, I Apologize For The Climate Scare.

<https://environmentalprogress.org/big-news/2020/6/29/on-behalf-of-environmentalists-i-apologize-for-the-climate-scare>. (Originally at Forbes Magazine)

[<sup>4</sup>] Neil Lock, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019: The War on Cars

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BUpOj7KabvM>

[<sup>5</sup>] United Kingdom Interdepartmental Liaison Group on Risk Assessment (UK-ILGRA), 2002: The Precautionary Principle: Policy and Application.

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20190701152341/https://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/committees/ilgra/pppa.htm>

[<sup>6</sup>] UK government: Collections: Carbon valuation, Last updated April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/carbon-valuation--2>

[<sup>7</sup>] Sky News, May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019: Majority of Brits unwilling to cut back to fight climate change, poll finds

<https://news.sky.com/story/majority-of-brits-unwilling-to-cut-back-to-fight-climate-change-poll-finds-11709486>

[<sup>8</sup>] Committee on Climate Change, May 2019: Net Zero – The UK’s contribution to stopping global warming

<https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Net-Zero-The-UKs-contribution-to-stopping-global-warming.pdf>

[<sup>9</sup>] UK FIRES: Absolute Zero. <https://ukfires.org/absolute-zero/>

---

[<sup>10</sup>] Honest Common Sense, May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019: The backstory behind the war on cars in the UK

<http://www.honestcommonsense.co.uk/2019/05/the-backstory-behind-war-on-cars-in-uk.html>

[<sup>11</sup>] Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020: Eliminate fossil fuels now – U.S. “MAGICC” model says why bother?

<https://www.cfact.org/2020/03/03/eliminate-fossil-fuels-now-u-s-climate-model-says-why-bother/>

[<sup>12</sup>] Financial Times, March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020: Zero emissions goal – the mess of Britain’s carbon taxes

<https://www.ft.com/content/c4e7cf36-61f5-11ea-a6cd-df28cc3c6a68>