

David Wright transcript, 011524

===

[00:00:00]

Introduction to Global Warming Debate

David: Man made global warming caused by burning, by the CO2 from burning fossil fuels is the greatest and most costly and most damaging hoax ever perpetrated on mankind in the history of the world.

Tom: My guest today is David Wright.

Impact of Power Plants and Renewable Energy

David: Gas, gas, nuclear and coal fired power plants are the most economical on land use in terms of their footprint, whereas, um, equivalent of one square yard of a gas fired power plant requires, uh, 73 square yards of solar panels or two hundred and thirty nine square yards.

of onshore wind turbines. So, you know, that is, okay, it's not so important and not so serious in Australia, of course, because we've got a lot of land, but in places like Britain, uh, and [00:01:00] in, in Denmark and Germany, uh, I, I've been listening to articles which show that, you know, Denmark is absolutely saturated with land.

wind turbines. You know, the scenery must be completely ruined. And that's the other trouble with the wind farms, wherever they are. And Australian farmers very recently have started complaining, started demonstrating against the government's moves to install wind farms, uh, on, on agricultural land, on their land for the two or three reasons.

Of course, uh, it, you know, uses agricultural land, which can't be used for food production. It also, uh, destroys, uh, beautiful, beautiful scenery. Australia has got some absolutely amazing scenery. And nobody really wants wind turbines and, uh, and electricity lines, [00:02:00] um, you know, all over them. So, you know, there is a lot, a lot of, you know, a lot of unhappiness, uh, worldwide in the West about, uh, renewables.

So I drive around Australia from time to time and, uh, because my wife and I go caravanning and you go past somewhere, uh, where you see, you know, from, from where you are, right to the horizon, a complete area covered in solar panels. It's terrible.

Effects of Wind Turbines on Wildlife

Tom: Um, I wanted to see if you had seen a recent story about wind turbines and the number of bats killed by wind turbines.

There was some deal where they had humans look for dead bats and they found maybe one, but they had dogs look for dead bats and they maybe found 65 or something. Have you heard about that?

David: I haven't heard about that, but it's been known for a long time, of course, that, uh, wind turbines kill bats, birds, and insects. [00:03:00]

And now we are learning that they are disturbing, uh, disturbing whales in the ocean, the offshore wind turbines. But one of the things, one of the things about, about, uh, wind turbines, uh, killing insects, of course, is that they are food for a lot of birds. Maybe not the big birds, but the raptors, the eagles, and so forth, are being killed.

Uh, and that's, that, you know, it's, it's significant. It's, it's, in some places, it's actually quite a worry, because these are, in some, some of the birds that are being killed, um, are rare. Eagles, uh, I think there's a certain eagle in the United States which is, uh, being killed by wind turbines and it is beginning to worry, uh, uh, people who, uh, are concerned about, um, the species.

Tom: Uh, Michael Connelly was on my podcast a while back and he was talking about [00:04:00] how wind turbines also affect the weather that, uh, rain, et cetera, on the other side of the wind turbines is affected by the presence of the wind turbine. So we're trying not to affect anything that's, uh, maybe that's not the way to go.

Of course, humans are going to affect the weather and climate a bit, no matter what, but what do you think about that?

David: Well.

The Paradox of Wind Turbines

David: All I can say about wind turbines is that they, they are, they are useless. Um, they, uh, the interesting, another interesting factor about wind turbines is, okay, you know, when they produce electricity, um, they are not producing carbon dioxide, uh, in order to generate electricity.

But the, uh, paradox is that the construction Transportation and installation of wind turbines, uh, requires the burning of fossil fuels. Uh, and that produces more CO2 than a [00:05:00] wind turbine will ever save in its 20 to 25 year life. And there has been one study very recently, which I read, uh, By somebody, I don't remember his name, but he he did a deep study of this problem, and he claimed that there is five times as much carbon dioxide produced in the production and installation, et cetera, of wind turbines as they as they save in their lifetimes.

And then you've also got, on top of that, Tom, you've got the problem of disposal. Um, you know, turbines on land will last for about 25 years, not as good as, uh, gas fired power stations, which will last 50 years, and offshore, about 20 years. And then what happens to them?

Tom: And there's this other issue of in this magical world powered by wind power and, uh, and, uh, solar panels, there's no way to construct wind [00:06:00] turbines and, uh, solar panels, right?

You can't use that form of energy to ever build, uh, the next generation of that energy, correct? Of course not.

David: Of course not. Wind and solar, uh, wind turbines and solar panels cannot build whereas electricity from coal and gas That can build things.

Tom: All right, so many problems. Uh, should we move down to your global food production point?

Global Food Production and Climate Change

David: Um, Yes, um, that's an interesting one because it's one of the scare stories that the the warmists, uh, like to tell lies about every time it subject comes up. Um, you know, food production is going to be seriously, uh, damaged, seriously impaired by, uh, global warming by, uh, you know, by man, of course, man made global warming.

Uh, the thing is, of course, that what has happened over the last, uh, [00:07:00] decades has been global greening. Um, we've had and this has been shown by satellite imaging or satellite images that at least 14 percent increase in the green area. of the world. And the other thing is crops, Food production will be seriously reduced by climate change, they say, uh, but we've had record harvests in India and some African countries, for example Zimbabwe. We recently had data from Ethiopia and the data from Ethiopia, I can quote to you, um, in the past three decades, where it's got a bit warmer.

Ethiopian cereal production increased by 467 percent, yields increased 112 percent, and all time production records were broken [00:08:00] nine times in Ethiopia between 2011 and 2021. So I think that puts that little scare story to bed.

Tom: Yeah, I mean, uh, it's not rocket science, is it? I just, I'm looking at some of my tweets here.

Uh, hottest year ever in 2023, supposedly. And, uh, the U. S. had a record corn crop in 2023. So, we're not going hungry because of trace CO2, no matter how you look at it.

David: And neither was 2023 the hottest year on record.

The Hypocrisy of Climate Change Advocates

Tom: Alright, do you want to talk about Michael Bloomberg and hypocrisy?

David: I certainly do. Michael Bloomberg, and I don't even have to read my notes here, Michael Bloomberg has got three airplanes, two helicopters, six yachts, 11 houses, and 42 cars. And he travels around the world preaching about how we must all reduce our carbon footprint.

[00:09:00] We then have John Kerry, who has five houses, a yacht, and a private jet. And he does the same sort of preaching around the world, as we know, although he's just relinquished that role, but that's hypocrisy from John Kerry. You know, you now have, uh, well, Al Gore is probably the worst example, but it's been established that his mansion uses 34 times as much electricity as the average American household.

And then Bill Gates, he has an electricity bill for his mansion, which is 30, 000 a month. And if you want, you know, if you want hypocrisy, um, sort of in bulk, you've only got to look at COP28. Uh, hundreds of private jets flying in, and, and thousands of [00:10:00] people flying in by, uh, commercial fossil fuel powered aircraft stay in five star luxury hotels.

They eat, uh, you know, they eat gourmet meals of wagyu beef and other such things, uh, while, um, you know, costing a hundred dollars a portion. They are driven around Dubai, or they were, were driven around Dubai, uh, in the electric cars. But the electric cars were charged by fossil fuel electricity. And all the while they tell us Stop traveling, stop eating meat, uh, and live a lousy life while we live it up.

See, you know, it's, it's one, you know, the whole global warming

movement is absolutely riddled with hypocrisy. Everybody, you know, all the people preaching about [00:11:00] it are basically wealthy people who it's not going to be affected by. So I

Tom: have one of Al Gore's older books, and he has the goal in one of those books to say that we should accomplish our long haul travel on buses, and we should line, line dry our clothes.

So my question to Al is, when's the last time you took a long haul bus trip, and when's the last time you line dried your clothes? It's amazing.

David: I mean, people like that, and we've had it in the UK, uh, and of course out here, but the UK, a comparatively small country, but we've got, uh, you know, politicians are particularly being criticized for taking, taking airplane flights, uh, from, from say the North of England to London or from Scotland to London, uh, when they could perfectly well take the train.

But no, oh no, you know, that's for, that's for the ordinary people. We're, we're not, it's do [00:12:00] as I say, don't do as I do.

Tom: I actually have done a little bit of flying in the last year, and I'm encouraged to see that the planes are packed and the airports are packed, and I don't think people are being shamed into not flying.

I think people are just flying every time they want to, which they should. It's

David: true. And that raises a couple of other very interesting points, which I read recently, Tom. One is that, uh, aircraft, uh, passenger aircraft manufacturers around the world have, uh, an order book, a backlog of orders. of 15, 000 aircraft.

The other interesting character, the other interesting development is that Dubai airport can currently handle about one and a half million passengers a year and the Dubai government is talking about, seriously talking about, developing a new airport in Dubai which by 2050, they want to be [00:13:00] able to handle 250 million passengers a year.

So I think there are some people who are reasonably confident that fossil fuels are going to be needed for a while longer.

There is only one way to fly, and that is with fossil fuel power.

Climate Change and Its Impact on Farming

David: um, You know about all the, uh, the farmers protests in, in the

Netherlands. They've, and they've started in Germany as well. But of course, the initial thing was that the government's, uh, proposals for, reducing, uh, the use of, uh, fertilizers because of production of, uh, nitrous oxide as a greenhouse gas.

But that is also, uh, you know, this is Mark Rutter, who thankfully has now been booted out. But, um, the other thing is when he was the Prime Minister, the Netherlands passed a law, which I'm sure will be still in place, which [00:14:00] says that Children cannot inherit a farm from their father or from their parents when their parents die, which is effectively a way to, uh, you know, to shut down a farm.

So the government mandated shutting down farms in the Netherlands. But there's, you know, there are many, many other examples in, in other countries about government, uh, government edicts, um, preventing people from, you know, doing, doing sensible things, leading, leading good lives and so forth. , I read recently about, uh, have you heard of this one? The former Swiss environmental minister, a woman, Simonetta Sommaruga. Do you know what she said? I don't. What did she say?

Seeking ways to reduce energy. Use, she suggested that people should shower together.[00:15:00]

And it can hardly get sillier than that, but there are other examples we had in February last year, the United Kingdom government, the Rishi Sunak government, um, ordered local government authorities to crack down on people using wood burning stoves with fines of up to 300 or 365. If they were caught. Now, when I lived in England, before, just before we emigrated, we had this fabulous wood burning stove, and we had lots of trees which we'd had to cut down, so we had a very solid supply of logs, and boy, did that help us to keep the house warm.

But, I thought to myself, okay, So what if, um, how would that be enforced? Would the police, um, go around looking at chimneys and if they saw smoke coming out, they knock on the door and [00:16:00] say, excuse me, sir, are you burning logs? And, uh, if the owner said, no, I'm not burning logs. Uh, uh, that smoke coming out of my chimney is Is, uh, is burning, what, newspaper or something, whatever.

Anyway, and the police officer would say, Well, can I come in and have a check, sir? And, uh, the, uh, the owner could say, Have you got a search warrant? I don't know. The whole thing was an absolutely stupid, stupid idea, but it was a government order. And we have, um, the, uh, we have the amazing situation now, and it's got a name, and I don't know the name of it, but companies are now being told to account for the carbon dioxide emissions of their suppliers, and also of the customers who bought their products.

Now that's going to make life very tough [00:17:00] for any company to

do.

Tom: Where would this happen? In which country?

David: Um, I believe it's happening in, in, in the United States and Europe. It hasn't happened yet in Australia, but I'm sure it will. You must, you must, talking of daft, daft things, you must have heard of a British environmental campaigner, uh, called George Monbiot.

You know what he said about farming?

Tom: I have it up here, but why don't you share that with the rest of us, yeah.

David: Farming should be abolished, he said. Farming is the most destructive force ever to have been unleashed by humans. That's a quotation from his latest book.

Tom: Now what percent of voters on earth think that that is a sane thing to say?

It can be very high, can it? I

David: don't think so, no. And

Tom: getting back to the whole farming thing, are you following the protests that are happening right now, [00:18:00] the German farmers? that are protesting. It looks like they're pushing back really hard.

David: They really are, and they've just said that the next protest is going to, is going to involve thousands of tractors.

It's, it's really big. It's really big. But then, you know, they have got, you know, ever since Angela Merkel, they have got a, a totally committed, um, warmest government. And of course, the Greens are a very powerful force in, in German politics. I

Tom: mean, do you think there's any chance that the Greens can win and we're going to stop farming or the farmers are going to say, no, that's not happening?

I mean, what do you think?

David: I don't think the, I don't think the Greens and the government will win this one. Uh, because you know, anybody with anybody with common sense, anybody who wants to ensure that they have their own, uh, you know, own ability to, to grow their own crops. Um, to feed, you know, at least partially [00:19:00] to feed themselves without importing food from other countries.

Um, everybody will support the farmers. And

Tom: getting back to Monbiot, he did say, uh, you have it here that, uh, we should, uh, abolish normal meat production and then replace it with food made from lab grown bacteria.

David: Yes, he did say that.

Tom: Again, what percent of voters do you think are going to go along with that?

It's got to be tiny, doesn't

David: it? I don't think very many. We've got, uh, we've got cases in the UK and here in Australia of vegan restaurants going out of business. I mean, I don't think many people are going to want to eat, uh, are going to want to eat food made out of insects.

Tom: Do you think there is a move afoot, though, to sneak insects into, like, bread and stuff?

I've read some articles about that, about their, oh, they're going to try to kind of sneak it in and hope we don't notice? [00:20:00]

David: Well, uh, I haven't heard that myself, Tom, but if they do, I think there's going to be a backlash. Okay, let's see here. After all, human, human beings have evolved to be meat eaters. After all, going back to the Stone Age, before, before human beings were even able to cultivate vegetables and crops, uh, human beings, uh, lived entirely on meat.

And since that time, you know, we have evolved into, uh, uh, people who have digestive systems and teeth, which, uh, enable us to eat meat as well as vegetables.

Tom: I always wonder about that. How did it go for the people who lived in the Arctic in the old days? How many vegetables did they get in the winter time?

Couldn't have been a lot.

David: I don't know. They probably just said reindeer.

The Role of Media in Climate Change Perception

David: Scaremongering [00:21:00] is, is the big, the big cause of the

belief in climate change, and we have, for example, in, in August last year, the Australian Greens, um, who oppose climate change. anything to do with fossil fuels. Um, they were opposing, um, any more, uh, gas production. Uh, and they didn't want, they didn't want the government to encourage any more gas, uh, supplies production.

And they, they said, and I quote, even as the planet boils around us.

Tom: That seems to be a new point of desperation, I think, because the UN, has been talking about global boiling. That seems like a new thing. It's

David: desperate, actually. I call Antonio Guterres climate scaremonger in chief. Yes, he started [00:22:00] talking about, you know, code red for mankind, uh, global heating, and then global boiling.

I think, I think somebody, somebody must be putting him up to these, uh, ideas, but it's very strange. The latest one, Tom, is, uh, is comparatively new, and, uh, within the last few months. And it's been, uh, raised as a scare by, uh, a mining billionaire in Australia by the name of Andrew Forrest. And Andrew Forrest has said that humidity is, is, lethal humidity is already here, he says.

And I thought to myself, well, I lived in Singapore and Indonesia virtually on the equator and certainly in the tropics. For at least 25 years of my life, and that was where humidity was permanently high, and of course people can [00:23:00] do that. But Andrew Forrest said, you can't get rid of the heat because, and I'm quoting him, if you can't, millions of people will die if you can't get rid of that heat because of humidity.

You cook yourself. And I think this. This man is a brilliant, successful mining magnate, um, highly educated. He has a Ph. D. title is Dr. Forrest. Um, how can he believe, or how can he, you know, where did he get this idea from? And how can he believe it? We've got, you know, We've got school children being scared about global warming.

Um, here's a few more quotes that I've noted. An international study of 16 to 25 year olds in 10 countries found that 59% [00:24:00] Are very worried, 75 percent thinking that the future is frightening and in 2021, a poll 56 percent of 16 to 24 year olds think humanity is doomed by climate change. My grandchildren who live just 10 miles from me here, we see them very often, really great, well educated, charming, clever young men.

Um, One of them has just got engaged to be married. Anyway, they are worried about it. I did a little research into um, school education here in New South Wales, and I looked at the curriculum of primary school children. And this is primary school children, and the

curriculum was riddled with mentions of climate change.

So this whole

Tom: idea, though, it's a lack of common sense is a big [00:25:00] problem here, I think, because we're, we have people, you said an adult is worried he's gonna die from, uh, from hot weather. But many places on earth you could easily die if you spend eight hours outside in the cold weather. We have lethal cold everywhere, of course, way more lethal cold than possible lethal heat.

Do these people not go outside or what's the problem?

David: I don't know, but every time there is, there is hot weather, the, um, the media, of course the media love all this, every time there is a heatwave, which is, it's never an unprecedented heatwave, but they always say it is, but every time there is a heatwave, they say, uh, hundreds or thousands of people will die, and in fact, people do die in heatwaves, but what they always fail to mention, which you will read in, in other media, is that Thousands more people die of the cold every year than ever die of the heat.

Tom: I mean, if you're homeless and you have to spend a night outside, you want it to be a [00:26:00] really warm night or a really cold night? Of course. Exactly.

David: Exactly.

Tom: Um, did you want to take a little time here to go through the four, uh, factors and why people believe in the climate scam?

David: . Why do politicians and business leaders and leaders generally seem to believe in, in global warming? Uh, so religiously, I'll come to that in a moment, but just, just to give you a few quotations. Uh, in August last year, our prime minister in Australia, Anthony Albanese, was asked what he would most like to achieve in his term in office.

very much. And he said, and this is a quote, I'm quoting this, if we could fix climate change so that we weren't dealing with the impact of increased frequency and intensity of natural disasters. Neither, there is no, Australia is a land of natural disasters, and most [00:27:00] people know that. It is a land of floods, droughts, and bushfires, and it always has been.

And every time there, you know, we've just experienced here in northern New South Wales and southern Queensland over the last few weeks, absolutely terrible flooding, terrible flooding.

Climate Change and Its Impact on Natural Disasters

David: But, there's been terrible flooding as bad or worse in the past. So A, it's not unprecedented, and B, it's not getting more frequent.

But you wouldn't, you know People have been fed this, uh, this talk, and, and another linking thing, we've got, oh, Joe. Oh, hold on.

Tom: Uh, that, that quote to me, though, is absolutely mind blowingly stupid, that he thinks he's going to somehow, uh, tweak CO2 and change global temperature, and that's going to reduce flood, droughts, and Australia, he's, he actually, he's an adult, and he believes this.

David: Yeah, he does. But he's, I think it's very unlikely that he will be re [00:28:00] elected in next year's general election. Yeah. Because, you know, he's doing a lot of things which people, not, not particularly, um, global warming matters, but he's doing a lot of things which people are protesting about. But going on from Antony Albanese, your own President Joe Biden, Uh, I went to Hanoi on the 10th of September, the G20 summit.

You know what he said? He said, and I'm quoting here, I'm reading it, the only existential threat humanity faces even more frightening than a nuclear war is global warming going above 1.5 degrees in the next 20 or 10 years. That was, that's, okay, so if we talked about common sense, there isn't any in modern politics.

So if Joe

Tom: had the chance to choose between either the earth warming and other a few tenths of a degrees [00:29:00] from here or nuclear war, he would choose the second one.

David: He took nuclear war as the, as the least worst option. Wow. Oh, another one. Another one. Good one. We were talking about how, you know, none, none of these, uh, disasters, uh, like, uh, droughts and fires and floods is unprecedented.

Um, a recent, um, report from, that I read was that NASA satellites, and they are pretty reliable, um, NASA, NASA satellites show that the area of the world burnt by forest fires has declined by 25%. Since they started collecting the data. So, you know, another story, which has been blown, blown out by the facts.

Tom: I'm sure you've seen this graph in the US where they graph how many acres burned each [00:30:00] year starting in maybe 1900 or so and it was way more in the first half of the 20th century than the second half But what they've done here is they pick the very lowest

year. It was either 1982 or 1983 And that is, they chose as their starting point because we can't trust the data before that.

So anyway, again, it's totally farcical that they're trying to convince us fires are getting worse when they're not. It is.

David: Here's a, here's a graph. Can you, can you see that? I can see that. Yep. Uh, it shows. It shows, and it's, it's produced by NASA, it shows how we've got to where we are now, and it's so much less.

Nice. But it's all driven, it's all driven by lies. It's all driven by lies.

The Politics and Economics of Climate Change

David: Now, you want me to say You want me to say, um, why I think people believe it, why I think politicians and everybody believes it? There, there are a number of reasons. Um, [00:31:00] the first thing I think is that it's not a cult, it's not a religion, it's a firmly held belief by a number of people.

They believe it, uh, although They have not ever been presented with any facts to, to confirm it. Okay, you know, we all know for a fact that Europe and the United States are separated by the Atlantic Ocean. But there, there are no facts ever produced. To show that the temperature of the world is increasing because of mankind's fossil fuel burning CO2 production.

But it is a belief that's been held by these people because of the endless propaganda. And the trouble is, you know, they're obviously supported by, by staff [00:32:00] members who prevent them from seeing Real, uh, data and real arguments about the good things about fossil fuels and the complete, uh, destruction of the man made global warming theory by eminent scientists such as Will Happa, Richard Lindzen, Ian Plymer, Willy Soon, there are endless sources.

You know, there are a very large number of very good, very well argued, loaded with real data, articles, newspapers, blogs, podcasts by people, really eminent people who are highly qualified about what they're talking about, um, saying, you know, there is no man made global warming. These are all ignored. Either because they're just totally ignored because they are rubbish or because they're prevented from being seen [00:33:00] by the staff members of these people.

So what you end up with is instead of, instead of politicians and world leaders and business leaders, uh, basing their actions and, and, uh, laws on, on, on real data, they are basing it on, The pronouncements of people, you know, really, really smart scientists

who know all about climate, such as Al Gore, King Charles, the Pope, Greta Thunberg, and those sort of people, it is just, you know, it's, it's a belief system, which is reinforced by the mainstream media.

And day after day, day after day, we have another example, you know,

Tom: By the way, isn't there some sort of dynamic where the left wingers absolutely scoff at everything the Pope says, except if he says something on their side about climate change, then they point at him, hey, let's [00:34:00] listen to the Pope on this one.

David: We've got, um, you know, the other reasons, other reasons why. They go on believing it, or even if they stop believing it, they don't say so because they'll lose face. We've got, uh, for example, here is, here is the British Prime Minister Rishi Sunak on the 7th of October last year. I'm proud that this country is already a world leader in reaching net zero by 2050.

And by doubling down on the new green industries of the future, we'll get there. We'll get there. But, you know, there, there are other factors at play here. Stupidity. I mean, some, some people, uh, not, not just scientific ignorance. Very few, very few leaders, especially in politics, um, have a grounding in science, you know, thermodynamics, physics, and chemistry.

So, you know, they, you know, they'll just [00:35:00] believe what they're told because they, they haven't got the scientific knowledge. Uh, to disagree with it, but, um, stupidity is another big factor, you know, we all make stupid decisions in our lives, Tom, I'm sure you, I have, I expect you have, but you know, examples of big national or corporate Stupid decisions, I can give you two right away.

One is the, uh, subprime mortgage, a fiasco in the United States some years ago. That was basically a whole cascade of stupid decisions being made and reinforced by by mates and other people. Another one which I thought was probably based on stupid decisions in management was the bankruptcy of Pan Am Airways.

You know, stupid decisions made At senior level in government and in business [00:36:00] are also part of the problem about global warming. It's being taught in schools, as I mentioned. And the other thing, the other thing is, of course, it's all about money. The warmists, uh, anybody who, who wants a government grant for any research they're doing has only got to mention the word climate change and they get money hosed at them.

And all the people making big bucks out of it. The, uh, of course the Chinese love it. They're making all the solar panels and wind turbines.

Tom: So I just tweeted about this today, that there was this, uh, idea that we need to spend 100 billion annually on climate. That, that was the number, 100 billion annually.

And now NPR just reported, no, the real number is 2, 000 billion annually.

Questioning the Climate Change Numbers

Tom: 2 trillion dollars, uh, tweaking CO2 or whatever. It's just, why don't they just say 11 zillion, just make [00:37:00] up numbers. Because, uh, it's, of course it's insane. Yeah.

David: Yes, that's what they're doing all the time. Any, any time you see numbers, uh, uh, like, um, oh, we're going to have, you know, we're going to have one, one million or, or three and a half million people displaced, uh, and become refugees because of climate change, the numbers are, are entirely plucked out of thin air.

They, it's impossible to calculate them, you know, the public is taken in. For now,

Tom: yeah.

Predicting the Future of Climate Change

Tom: Do you think that just the mere passage of time is going to cause this to die off? That people have been promised an apocalypse coming up in five or ten years, and that time passes and the apocalypse never comes? Do you think that's going to happen?

David: The people, the people like, uh, King Charles, the Pope and others who do honestly believe that, uh, you know, we are in a climate [00:38:00] catastrophe and it's going to happen. And Antony Albanese, our Prime Minister here in Australia, is trying to speed up the, uh, The removal of fossil fuels. He wants to get to 80 percent electricity generation in Australia by 2037 is he's he's bringing the target forward all the time, but of course, the actual installation of wind turbines and solar panels is way, way behind.

We have this.

The Reality of Renewable Energy in Australia

David: We have this extraordinary project in Australia called Snowy. Snowy two. Have you heard of Snowy two? I have not. I don't know that. Okay. Well, one of the great success stories, uh, of, uh, of electricity generation in Australia, which started when I was, uh, you know, when I started, when I was in submarines, basically, uh, a long time ago was the Snowy Mountains scheme.

And that was a scheme [00:39:00] for damming, uh, damming rivers in the Snowy Mountains of, uh, Victoria and passing. The water from the dams through, uh, Pelton wheel turbines to generate electricity work very well. We have recently introduced by the previous government, um, in order to combat climate change, what what's called Snowy 2 and Snowy 2 is essentially a big battery project.

The idea is to use surplus electricity, Uh, from wind power at night when it's not needed to pump water up to the reservoir or up to another reservoir, I think it is, uh, and then let it run down and generally generate electricity when it's needed effectively a battery.

The Cost of Renewable Energy Projects

David: Uh, the only problem is it was [00:40:00] originally budgeted at 2 billion Australian dollars.

It's now currently expected to be, uh, you know, and growing at the currently 12 billion. Um, the date for it to come into operation is just slipping. All the time. It's already slipped by six years and it's going to go on and it's, it's basically, um, you know, the, the big engineering feat of it is, is a gigantic boring machine, which has got to bore through the, through the earth to provide space for these tubes of water to come back down.

This boring machine. I don't know how many kilometers it's got to run, but it's been stuck for months, and it's, you know, in the last three or four months, it's done about four meters, so it's an absolute fiasco. [00:41:00] But the next thing, the next important thing related to that is that in order, if it, you know, if it ever comes to fruition, then how is electricity from there distributed to cities like Melbourne, Adelaide, Melbourne, Uh, Sydney even and towns in between and the answer is thousands of kilometers of electric cables, uh, and, and the pylons or, or towers, which you need at least one per kilometer and probably two, you know, so that the, the countryside and there's some fantastic national parks in that area.

The Impact of Renewable Energy on the Environment

David: It's going to be littered and, and covered with electric cables and electric cable supporting towers. Which brings, which brings me to another example of, of pure ignorance, which I read the other day. There was a letter to, uh, the Australian newspaper saying [00:42:00] that, um, the writer believed that there would not be enough, uh, copper in the world to provide to make the electric cables for transmitting electricity over, you know, from production to use.

The writer obviously I didn't know that the cables are made of aluminium. And if they were made of copper, they would be so heavy, they would be completely

Tom: But there's all sorts of schemes that kind of sound good to people who don't understand any of the engineering or the science, right? Like, let's just run a cable, a 3, 000 mile cable, from where the energy is to where we need it.

David:

The Inefficiency of Wind and Solar Power

David: The terrible thing about renewables is that they produce actually produce so little electricity. Um, generally speaking, it's, it's actually accepted and acknowledged the fact that, [00:43:00] um, wind turbines produce, uh, Roughly a quarter of their nameplate capacity.

So you see these fantastic headlines from a wind farm developer who says, Yes, we're going to have, uh, you're going to have build this wind farm. And it's going to, it's going to produce enough power to provide power for 20, 000 homes. But the real

Tom: number is it's enough power to power zero homes when the wind isn't blowing, right?

Correct.

David: And overall, over a year, you know, 20, 000 homes is its nameplate capacity as it's called. But over a year, the average is 23 to 26 percent of that, of that capacity. So, you know, it's based on, uh, fraud, basically. It's a fraudulent assumption. Worse yet, It's solar panels, solar [00:44:00] panels. Um, what have we got here?

No, I haven't got the figure for solar panels, but it's even worse. I've got two very good examples here. Um, on December the 12th, 2022 in the UK. Lovely, you know, snow all over the country. Beautiful. Renewables were providing 2 percent of the electricity. Uh, the year earlier, in December 2021, on the 19th of December, Uh, renewables

were providing less than 1 percent of the electric power of Britain.

And that is, that is what happens. And just, just now, just this, this month, I read on the 13th of January, did you read about Alberta, Canada? Oh, I did, yeah. Wind, 2.6 [00:45:00] percent of the power, solar, zero. So, you know, what is the use of these things? There is no use for them.

The Hoax of Man-Made Global Warming

David: But the worst thing of all is that it's all a hoax.

Man made global warming caused by burning, by the CO2 for burning fossil fuels is the greatest and most costly and most damaging hoax ever perpetrated on mankind in the history of the world. That, if you like, is my parting shot.

Tom: That's a great clip right there. That's what I was thinking. That's a clip.

Let's see.

The Consequences of Decommissioning Britain's Gas Grid

Tom: Uh, but before we do wrap up though, uh, do you wanna talk about this whole issue of decommissioning Britain's gas grid? I had not heard about that until you emailed me about

David: that. Yeah. Well, you know, gas, uh, is being, I've got, I've got the figures here. Yeah. [00:46:00] Um, um, the Britain, Britain has got 176,000 miles.

Of gas piping to provide gas to industry and homes. Um, and of course, because it's running constantly, and it's, uh, it's being maintained by the gas companies, uh, so that it doesn't fail at any time and doesn't, you know, doesn't develop leaks and that sort of thing. So that is something that's being done all the time, constantly.

And in fact, there are gas pipes. Company vans that you see driving around the UK and I used to see them and it said, if you have a gas leak or if you're aware of a gas leak, call this number. So it's, they're on top of it the whole time. But if that pipework is no longer being used for gas, and it can't be used for hydrogen, even if hydrogen was ever going to be an alternative fuel, which it isn't, but it can't be used for anything else.

[00:47:00] So what's going to happen? It's, you know. Nobody's going to do any maintenance on it. And so it's going to start collapsing. And that is a worry about, you know, collapsing, uh, under roads and places like that. So it's been estimated that it's going to cost, uh, 65, uh, billion pounds or 79 billion U. S. dollars to get, to remove all the gas piping.

All the miles of gas piping in Britain. So,

Tom: so people are seriously talking about this to dig up 176, 000 miles, and then they're going to power the country with wind and solar panels. That's the plan.

David: Well, it is, you know, this is according to a draft national infrastructure report, you know, that is the mileage of.

The gas pipes and they have, you know, if they're not used, they'll have to be dug up and it's going to cost a lot, but you know, because Britain is heading [00:48:00] towards net zero, they won't be used. That's, you know, that's the future that seems to be a predicted by all the warmest and be being followed by the politicians in order in order to achieve.

This magic situation of net zero. So, but basically it's all pointless because it's, because it's a fraud. So all the wind farms, all the solar farms, all the electric cars. They're all completely pointless.

Tom: I 100 percent agree. Has anybody calculated how much avoided global warming we get by 2050 if we do all of this stuff?

What's the number? How many degrees centigrade?

David: I don't, I don't believe anybody has calculated. I don't believe anybody can calculate it because it's not going to make the slightest difference. You know, as I say, as I say to, to, [00:49:00] you know, we know this figure, uh, the actual percentage of man made carbon dioxide in the whole world's atmosphere is 0.

001%. That's the man made CO2 in the world's atmosphere. Of course, there's lots of natural CO2, 420 parts per minute, but that's man made. Now, if we stop producing it yet, if the whole world, China and everybody else, either eventually or suddenly, Stopped producing carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels.

That would reduce that 0. 3 noughts, one percent, to nought. Would that make any difference to the climate? I don't think so.

Tom: Yeah, and as I've said before, I think we could spend 50 trillion dollars, pick any number you want, all this expense, all this trouble, and it'll make no measurable difference to climate or weather.

Let alone a [00:50:00] benefit. I don't think anything we can't measure any difference at the end of all this, and I hope that eventually people figure this out. Well,

David: I hope so, Tom, because the climate is actually controlled by the sun and the oceans, and it's a chaotic system. It is a chaotic system, which mankind has not got the control of and cannot ever have the control of.

And the other thing, the other thing, the other figure I, I like to mention in talks, these sorts of discussions is, is that Do, do people really know what a tri how big a trillion is? And the way I visualize it is that a trillion seconds is 30, 000 years, so a trillion dollars, just one trillion dollars, is an awful lot of money.

And we can spend trillions on trying to combat the non existent. Climate [00:51:00] catastrophe, but we don't seem, as somebody pointed out recently, we, we don't seem to be able to solve homelessness, world hunger, and lack of housing, you know, governments not concentrating on it. They're spending the trillions on an ephemera.

Tom: Yeah, it's a good point that there might be something else that we could spend the money on if we're going to spend it at all. Every other thing.

David: The other, the other key point that we need to remember is in spite of all this, you know, where everybody everywhere else everywhere is theoretically trying to cut down the use of electricity.

But there are three big factors which work against that.

The Increasing Demand for Electricity

David: One is the increasing requirements of the developing world, Africa. India, China, everywhere, you know, they are consuming and producing and needing more and [00:52:00] more electricity. Thing number two is that more and more electric vehicles are coming onto the market and being used by the populations of the world.

And of course, you know, the demand for electricity to charge them is going up dramatically as well. And thing number three is, uh, what people, I suspect, not really, uh, switched on to. And that is Computers, computer use, and the world's insatiable hunger for data and data is the demand for data. All over the world, not just the western world, but the demand is skyrocketing.

And what does that mean? It means vastly increased numbers of

computers, va and more and worse, vastly increased numbers [00:53:00] of server farms and, you know, the, the cloud where the data is all stored and you have these huge solar, um. Um, server farms which require a vast amount of electricity to run and even more electricity to keep cool.

So, you know, the, the increase in demand for data is a huge, a huge factor in the increasing demand for electricity worldwide. So those three factors, those three factors, it's got my fingers in the screen. Um, so, Working against, uh, getting to net zero. So what do you

Tom: think of companies like Apple that say straight up, you know, our new data center is 100 percent powered by renewable energy?

I say it's a straight up lie and it's fraud and it drives me nuts that they're getting away with it because they're plugged into the same grid everybody else is.

David: Well, that's the thing. Um, all the global warming [00:54:00] business is based on lies. We have, we have, uh, NASA, uh, NOAA, um, the British Met Office is a very good example, but most meteorological, uh, national meteorological organizations are, are tell lies about, about the climate, you know, oh, this is the hottest year since so and so when it isn't, um, and, uh, you know, All, all sorts, all sorts of lies, all sorts of lies, the data is manipulated, selected, like that little graph I showed you, they choose, if you want, if you want to demonstrate global warming by a graph, you start the graph at the bottom.

and see it going up. But the bit before the bottom, it was coming down, but they don't show that, of course.

Tom: It just seems like the lies are escalating, and we've gotten to the [00:55:00] point where the UN guy is saying, uh, he's talking about global boiling. I mean, where do they go from here to turn up the hype knob?

Or are they done? Is there more?

David: I don't, I, I don't know. The world's on fire. I don't, don't think they can hype it up anymore. They just keep, just keep repeating it. And, uh, you know, every, every time, every time we have a, a bushfire or a flood, uh, oh, we're drowning or we're burning.

Tom: I got one here. Hold on here.

Oh, yeah, there's this new group called Climate Defiance, a youth group. I don't know. They're on Twitter. You may not have seen this. But they are saying that, um, quote, our fish are burning alive. I think that's a, that's a new one I had not heard until today.

David: How can anybody burn in water? Yeah,

Tom: it seems like they're getting, again, uh, I don't know how much more hype they can, uh, [00:56:00] they can come up with.

I think they're almost done.

David: Well, I think they're almost done, but, you know, you produce, you produce. You form a group like that and start producing, uh, comments like that, and a lot of people will start giving them money. I

Tom: guess.

David: Renewables create more problems than they solve. And for example, here in Australia and in the UK, and I'm sure everywhere else as well, um, wind farms, uh, get paid to produce electricity when the wind's blowing.

But if the wind's too strong, or if there's not enough wind, if the wind's too strong, they have to stop. And if there's not enough wind, they do stop, and they then get what's called constraint payments. And constraint payments are guaranteed sums of money paid to the wind farm companies when they're not producing electricity.

So, you know, it's all paid for by [00:57:00] consumers on their bills because of subsidies, but that's what constraint payments are. And wind farms, we've got You know, this recent information here in Australia, and of course it's very well known in the UK, I'm sure it's true in the United States, that, uh, renewables cannot make money.

You know, a renewable generating company cannot make money without subsidies, big subsidies. In the UK, subsidies to, uh, wind and solar are running at about 10 billion dollars, uh, pounds a year. That's subsidies so that they can sell their electricity and, and, you know, make money for themselves.

Tom: So, of course, there's some crony capitalism going on here, right?

Where these companies that are getting the constraint payments, they were involved in lobbying to make this happen.

David: Yes, yes. And not only that, but, um, the companies, uh, that put wind [00:58:00] farms on land pay rent to the landowner, of course. And the landowners, in some cases, are cronies. Um, Lord Deben in the United Kingdom is a good example of that, but I won't go into it.

We then got the problem of decommissioning. You know, 20 years for offshore, 25 years for onshore. Um, what happens to them when they're decommissioned and who pays? I worry that in some cases, maybe a lot of cases, we will have, you know, there were no, there were no, what you might call, performance bonds lodged by the developers to ensure that they removed the wind turbines.

When they failed or when they ran the reach the ends of their lives. So what happens to them? Do they get left there? Do they get left to rot on another wind farm or another wind turbine built up alongside them? Or if they are [00:59:00] removed, what happens to the material? We know that wind turbine blades. Are not biodegradable.

And we know that currently a lot of them and all the solar panels as well are being junked and buried. In fact, you know, this has been happening already in Australia. So, you know, it uses land and be it creates a potential. toxic, uh, toxic problem for, um, for the land around

Tom: it. So, um, do we have any real world data backing up the idea that a wind turbine on land lasts an average of 25 years?

Because I thought I've heard that in the real world it might be half that on average. Well,

David: um, 25 years has been the figure generally bandied about by all the material that I have read about the life of a turbine. And I think, of course, we know that it's shorter in the unit in offshore because of the corrosive environment.

So, you know, that's one of the [01:00:00] problems. Oh, another one I read. Very interesting. Turbine, wind turbines have been increasing. In size for a long time. And if you and I have, I have done it because there is a there is a wind farm that I used to drive past every few months. It's a place called Crookwell in New South Wales, and it has a fairly large wind farm on it.

And the last time I drove through it, I could see some new turbines with Most gigantic blades compared with the smaller blades on the earlier installed wind turbines on that farm. And now we've got to the stage where the wind turbine blades are so large that because of the speed rotation on the upswing, they are having the blade tips damaged by rain.

I had not heard that. It's, it's the latest discovery about, uh, you know, the [01:01:00] problems of wind farms, and it's generally accepted that wind turbines need a terrific lot of maintenance, terrific lot of maintenance. So,

Tom: I don't know if you know off the top of your head how fast the

tip of the blade is going, but it's really hard for a raptor to get out of the way

David: if that thing's coming out.

I don't, I don't know, uh, but I believe that, uh, uh, birds and bats Uh, destruction and killing by wind turbines is caused by, um, is caused by the pressure difference when they fly through and it sucks the air out of their lungs and kills them. I don't think it's usually by collision. I always thought it was by collision, but I've just recently heard that it's, it's, it's due to wind pressure alterations.

That's it really, I think. I think.

The Future of Renewable Energy and Net Zero

David: Trouble is, of course, you know, we're all virtually reliant on China for wind turbines and solar panels [01:02:00] and all the rare earths which are largely controlled by China. So China loves net zero.

Tom: Do you have any sense as to whether they're actively pushing places like the U.

S. toward net zero? Or they're just setting back and enjoying the fruits of that? I

David: I really have no idea, Tom, but I have long suspected that it's preached in Confucius Institutes. I don't know, but I suspect. I would, I think it would be a very, you've still got Confucius Institutes in universities in America, I believe, haven't you?

I'm not sure about that. We still have them in Australia, uh, and I would love somebody to go into one and listen, but that's just a pure suspicion. But there is no doubt in my mind that China is pushing, uh, you know, pushing the global warming scare because, you know, they benefit so hugely from it.

Tom: Um, I have to [01:03:00] ask here that, uh, you've done so much great writing about the folly of net zero.

Are you familiar with, uh, Roger Pilkey Jr. over here in the U. S.? Who understands that this climate thing is, uh, a scam, but yet he's still in favor of net zero. That drives me crazy. Uh, do you have any comments on that? Like, uh, how can that be?

David: It seems, it seems paradoxical, Tom. I don't know his story at all.

I've heard his name, but I haven't studied what he says. Uh, but no, but when you get, when you get, what is it? 1, 906 scientists signing a declaration saying there is no climate emergency. You know that one? The clintell, yeah. Yeah, uh, ignored by the politicians, ignored by the mainstream media. You knew it, I knew it, because we read about it in the non mainstream media, which is, you know, the only place you will find the truth about the global [01:04:00] warming hoax.

Tom: Yeah, that Clintel thing is a excellent source. Marcel Kroc is one of the people behind it. He was on my podcast, but I think he's doing a great job of getting that list updated.

David: Yes, he has. Yes, yes. Fantastic. I just, I just wish the politicians would even read it. It's, it's only a few lines. It's a huge document, but most of it is the signatures.

Tom: We'll have to work on that.

David: I worry for my grandchildren. Uh, you know, I may, may still be alive in seven years time in 20, 2030, 2035. I don't know, you know, but, uh, I'm already, you know, we're, we're already feeling, uh, the pinch, the costs, you know, cost of living is shooting up fuel.

fuel prices, electricity prices, um, but it's not affecting me very much, uh, and I don't suppose it will because of, you know, I'll, I'll be dead before it becomes really serious, but I do worry desperately [01:05:00] that the, you know, the mindless Pursuit of net zero, which seems to be happily followed by all our leaders.

I just think it's going to be, it's going to become far more serious before the world wakes up. And eventually, um, most people think that, uh, it will cause civil unrest or, you know, it's already causing Some civil unrest in Germany and the Netherlands, uh, but not really anywhere else. But my, my great, greatly admired, uh, person, Professor Ian Plymer, I know you've interviewed him.

I met him and he gave us a talk here in Sydney one day and I said to him at the end of the talk, I said, When do you think, uh, the politicians and people will realize, uh, the problem? Uh, [01:06:00] and he said, never. And I'll finish up, Tom, as this, I think we're coming to the end. I'll finish up with a quotation, which I have here, which is from Professor Ian Plymer.

eminent geologist. And this is what he says. Anthropogenic climate change is an unproven hypothesis without a single credible peer reviewed paper proving its proposition. And this is after at least 50 years of intense money no object scientific effort all to no avail. If there was such a paper, You would never hear the last of it.

Tom: That is a great quote. All right. Let's go ahead and finish up on

that one. But David Wright, thank you very much. I really uh, enjoy talking to you. You're an interesting guy. You too.

David: It's a great pleasure, Tom. Bye for now. All right. Goodbye