

## WHY NET ZERO IS A CON, NATURE'S TAKEN CARE OF IT

### NET ZERO CONUNDRUM OR MODERN DAY PROPAGANDA

Why Net Zero is a clever con. It is designed to convince you of a lie, by using the truth. This is known as Paltering.

The term Paltering, coined by psychologist Robert Feldman, describes the act of using truthful statements to mislead someone. The core of this tactic is the intention to mislead, even if the statements themselves are factually correct.

What is Net Zero. The experts claim that the excess carbon dioxide that humans produce must be reduced to a level, which is lower than can be removed from the atmosphere. Meaning if we produce ten tonnes of carbon dioxide then we must take measures to remove at least ten tonnes of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, leaving us with a net zero amount of carbon dioxide. This is a theory that has no merit on planet earth.

Now let us deal in science facts. The air composition at any time is comprised of the following; Nitrogen (N) 78.08%, Oxygen (O) 20.95%, Argon (Ar) 0.93% and Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) 0.04% with all other gasses, hydrogen, helium, krypton, neon, and methane. This does not mean that these percentages are constant as they can change at any time during a typical day. If a volcano erupts or a wild fire starts or manufacturing goes into overdrive, all these would produce additional amounts of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. So, if you were to take a carbon dioxide reading near an active volcano or wild fire, then the carbon dioxide levels would read far higher than 0.04%. But the earth's ecosystem is designed to create balanced levels and deal with any fluctuations.

Plant life, including algae, typically breathes in carbon dioxide and breathes out oxygen. Animal life is the opposite; it breathes in oxygen and breathes out carbon dioxide. The result of this is, that there is a natural balance in the ecosystem, which results in the typical atmosphere reading composition as stated above. So, the planet already has its own system for creating net zero, or as close to it as possible. i.e. 0.04% carbon dioxide. No matter what you do, an animal, fire or volcano will always be producing carbon dioxide somewhere, so, no matter how hard the plants try, they will never ever remove carbon dioxide completely, but with nett carbon dioxide at an average of net 0.04%, is a pretty good effort and as close as anyone could ever get to zero. And this is all done by mother earth, in despite of humans.

This is a fact, which in despite of the fact, that since 1840 humans have industrialised and significantly increased the amount of carbon dioxide that is produced daily, the planet has coped and will continue to cope. The irony is, that climate activists point to the deserts as proof of global warming through climate change, but the reality is, that with the increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere the planet has produced more vegetation to take up the increase, which has resulted in barren deserts starting to see regrowth of trees and plants in places where they once did not grow. Therefore, it can be argued that humans, who have produced more carbon dioxide, are in fact helping the planet to revegetate.

Trees typically breathe in carbon dioxide and breathe out oxygen during the day, but at night the opposite occurs, with trees breathing in oxygen and breathing out carbon dioxide. This means that in theory you could have a planet just of trees and nothing else, as they would produce their own food supply. Whereas animals only breathe in oxygen and breathe out carbon dioxide, so a planet of animals would eventually die of suffocation, which is exactly what happens when a human is trapped in an air tight vault, they will eventually use up all the available oxygen and then start to exhale and inhale carbon monoxide, which is poisonous and they die.

Why has carbon dioxide become the new bogey man. Well, when you are promoting a con, you need a villain or scapegoat to blame. History shows that there is always someone to blame for your problems. Today, it is immigration brought on by the climate emergency. So, when selling the climate con, you must show a problem and provide something to blame for it. Hence carbon dioxide has become the new scapegoat.

If only we could eliminate all the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, then the world would be a much better place. Oh really, without carbon dioxide, trees would not be able to take in the carbon dioxide

and break it down and expel the oxygen. The old saying of "money doesn't grow on trees," is not the case here, as literally oxygen is produced from trees. So, by eliminating carbon dioxide we will ultimately run out of oxygen and all die. So, where did this nonsense originate. Well, the con has been going on since the 1960s, but the villain or scapegoat, carbon dioxide, has only been introduced in the past thirty years. When they discovered that the planet Venus was affected by the greenhouse effect, they determined that the atmosphere of Venus was 97% carbon dioxide, but from memory they use to say it was methane gas. Accepting the fact that the atmosphere of Venus is 97% carbon dioxide, the effects on Venus are, that the air temperature is extremely high, because the excess heat cannot escape due to the carbon layer trapping in the heat. Whether it is the carbon layer, which from memory used to be a methane gas layer, is the cause; or whether the fact that Venus is so close to the sun and it is the rays of the sun that are actually heating up the planet and maintaining the heat levels, is, irrelevant to the climate activists, who use Venus as a worst-case scenario for earth.

Taking that the atmosphere on Venus is 97% carbon dioxide, then is the problem just carbon dioxide or the percentage amount in the atmosphere. If it is the percentage amount, then at what percentage of carbon dioxide in the air, tips the balance from a non-green house to a green-house environment. Is it 90%, 75%, 50%, 25% or less. This is important because we need to determine whether earth's atmosphere could ever reach that tipping point; and the tipping point would dependent upon the amount of carbon dioxide that earth can produce.

To create carbon dioxide you need carbon, fire, and oxygen. Fire burns carbon using oxygen which results in a chemical reaction producing carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), or one carbon molecule and two oxygen molecules. So, you need two oxygen molecules for every carbon molecule to produce carbon dioxide. Earth's atmosphere is 20.95% oxygen, so, in theory the maximum amount of carbon dioxide that could be produced naturally would be 20.95% oxygen divided by two, equals 10.475% plus one carbon molecule. So, the maximum amount of carbon dioxide that we can produce naturally is approximately 11%. After that we run out of oxygen to create the chemical reaction to produce the carbon dioxide. At 11%, all animal life could become extinct, because of the lack of oxygen. Vegetation on the other hand would flourish, but then that would start producing oxygen again, which defeats the purpose of the exercise. But this simple mathematical example proves that there is only so much carbon dioxide that can be created and by the time the atmosphere reaches 11% carbon dioxide, it would be game over for humans anyway.

If we accept that carbon dioxide is not the cause, then what about climate change and global warming, how do you explain these indisputable facts. Simple, use logic to confuse people.

So, climate change and global warning, is it true or false. Obviously, it is true. Who can argue against climate change or global warming. Every normal sane person knows that we have four seasons, spring, summer, autumn, and winter, and does not the climate change with each season. What about night and day, doesn't it get colder at night, but heats up during the day; and doesn't this fact happen all over the planet. If you take a stance, that there is no such thing as climate change or global warming, then you are denying that the seasons exist and that night and day doesn't happen. So, only an imbecile would hold that view. So, if every sensible, well-meaning person, are right in the head, then they must believe that climate change and global warming exist. Clever isn't it. By default, you support the very thing that you oppose. How can you deny climate change when you know it is true. The crux of the matter, is, not that climate change and global warming doesn't exist, but the pertinent fact, is, that they are not detrimental to the planet and are just a normal part of life on earth. Unfortunately, it is far easier for the average person to go along with a clever lie, than speak out and challenge it and risk being ridiculed by the mob.

If we accept all of the above, then "what's it all about Greta?". It would be great to say something profound, amazing, or spectacular, but the simple truth, is, it is all about "the money". The con-men have developed a simple, but effective way of conning every one out of their hard-earned money, by propagating a lie, that imbecilic morons and sorry politicians, have bought in to. Because politicians' worldwide have swallowed this lie hook, line and sinker, they are spending enormous amounts of money on changing our energy producing systems, to carbon neutral systems, which are far more expensive, inefficient, unreliable and produce more pollution and poisonous substances, which cause far more harm to the planet than carbon dioxide.

The climate con has two purposes and they are, to make millionaires, billionaires and trillionaires. How's that going? very well thank you. And what about the rest of us, how's it going for you. Higher electricity bills, higher gas bills, unreliable power supplies, blackouts, reduced manufacturing in the west, people freezing in winter and boiling in summer, all because it is too expensive to heat or cool your homes.

Isn't it ironic, that Christopher Bowen and Jacinta Allen, who are so keen to remove your cheap electricity producing coal fired power stations, the gas from your homes and warn us to prepare for blackouts, all in the name of eliminating carbon dioxide; announce these policies at a press conference, which just prior to commencing, participate in an aboriginal welcome to country ceremony, which involved the burning of eucalyptus leaves, which produced carbon dioxide, the very thing they are opposed to. The hypocrisy and stupidity seem to have no bounds with these idiots.