

Marcotte transcript 012824

===

[00:00:00]

Introduction and Guest Background

Joanne: There's no consensus on the 97 percent. There's no consensus on the dangerousness of climate change. There's no Consensus on the anthropogenic sole responsibility of the recent warming. There's no consensus on net zero at all.

Tom: My guest today is Joanne Marcotte ,

Joanne: I live near the city of Quebec City, it's capital. Um, as for the academic background, I was a system architect, uh, for financial institutions and government agencies up till 2006.

And then in 2007, I got interested in politics. And I examined what the Quebec Social Demo Democratic system looked like, and I was appalled. So I did a documentary on that and you can see right then and there that I'm allergic to virtue signaling . So, um, that, that was nice. Um, the Quiet Illusion, it's called, you can see it on my blog com [00:01:00] and in.

2011, people asked me for a sequel, so I did a book, and it's called, in French, Pour en finir avec le gouvernement. In English, it would have been titled, Enough with the Nanny State.

The Climate Change Consensus Debate

Joanne: Um, and then, ten years later, I just wanted to know what's happening in the climate scene for myself. And I've read these beautiful authors, and I did a book.

I wasn't supposed to do a book. I was supposed to do some blogs. But then I said, Oh, no, no, this is too important. And I need to tell people what I learned. And it was, the result is this book, Inconvenient Doubts, if you will.

Tom: So I've been I've been reading that book on Kindle. I'm just curious. How much work did you put in?

It looks like hundreds and hundreds of hours. Is that right? Well,

Joanne: you could. Well, you could not a couple of years of reading.

[00:02:00] Um, and trying to synthesize the whole thing and To make up my mind. Okay. Well, these people first to select the good people. Um, and then, uh, yeah, trying to, to organize the, the, the knowledge that I was acquiring.

And, um, it took a lot of tests, three, four tests to make. A table of contents with that I would be proud of and that could be understandable for people like me who two or three years ago did not, did not know anything about this. And so I would, I would say a couple of years. Yeah.

Tom: Yeah. It's fantastic work.

I really commend you. I have really enjoyed reading it so far. Excellent work. Thank you. Thank you. So are you ready to do a fire up your, uh, presentation

Joanne: here? Sure. So that was who I am.

The Role of CO2 in Climate Change

Joanne: Um, why write this book? Uh, well, I was observing a lot of echoic anxiety, [00:03:00] uh, energy instability in Europe. Um, the enormous cost.

that we're not talking billions anymore, we're talking trillions. Um, I was, I was learning that there needed to be some transform, transformational change imposed by these unelected agencies somewhere in Europe and the United Nations and the IPCC that worried me, uh, in terms of democratic, um, process. And I did not see, um, The media cover cost benefit analysis, and that bothered me a lot.

So, so why did I write this book? Seeing more harm than good, I wanted to make up my mind, my own mind. Uh, since I don't, I don't trust, I'm not a trusting person, uh, towards the media, so I wanted really to read. a bit and try to understand the bit [00:04:00] of science that's underneath that, all that. And then I needed to share, very sharing person.

So, and writing, writing is a good tool to share knowledge. So, um, and this, um, National Post Columnist, um, Barbara Kaye of the National Post, um, offered me a quote to put on the back of my book and what she understands is the book is a lucid guided tour of counter conclusions from four highly accredited and rational islanders whose data based very important, dissent, offers welcome light in contrast to emotive alarmist heat.

So I was very proud that she offered me that. So, uh, and these are

the sources and inspirations that I, that I, that you could read in my book. Um, I'm really, really, I was, I had real great pleasure in reading these people. Uh, they [00:05:00] are humanists. Um, they are, um, very preoccupied by the moral, um, the moral aspect of this transformational change that is proposed by the United Nations.

And so you have here people that your listeners, of course, know, um, Michael Schellenberger's Apocalypse Never, Bjorn Lomborg, False Alarm. We have, uh, Stephen Koonin. Which I also loved, uh, Unsettled, as if the science is unsettled, and there's this Judith Curry that caught me by surprise because I was, I was always, almost finishing the book and then this girl comes along, Judith Curry, And she, she, she, um, she flabbergasted me.

I wrote, I read her book and it was really accessible for me. And, uh, really, really, uh, anyways, all these four people, like I just [00:06:00] love, but they talk about other people, you know? So, uh, There's Bernie Lewin that wrote some sort of history of the IPCC, and it's of course Susan Crawford that, that you people know and that you received on your, on your B0 podcast, I think, and also mentioned in the book are all these peoples to the right.

Richard Linson, William Hop, Patrick Moore, um, Ross McKittrick with which I love. He's a national post columnist, but also a professor. And, uh. Economist in iron vent environmental, uh, knowledge and the Clinton report. Of course, the, um, the frozen climate views of the IPC. Anyways, these are all papers that I wrote, that I read and that inspired the book.

And you, because the book is essentially a resume, uh, of, of what I. Get back what I what I understand is the science. So what I'll present today.

The Impact of Climate Change Policies

Joanne: We'll talk [00:07:00] about the consensus because the consensus is where it all started. I will talk about the state as I understand the state of climate science today.

Net zero CO2 what and then what it really is alarming if you want to be alarmed. What really is alarming, and I have a slide on that, and what could be also encouraging in the conclusion. So, to get back to this consensus thing, it started in 1992 at the 3rd Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, in Brazil. And the agenda was to establish a United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which entered in force in March 99.

So it's been 30 years that we've been talking about this so called

consensus. And what it was, believe it or not, it was a consensus that had no [00:08:00] science to demonstrate Behind which there was no science to demonstrate at the time global warming, no science to um, confirm its causes, and no science that confirmed its dangerousness.

So this was the chapter one of the Bible of the IPCC, if you, if you can call it. And Judith Currie, Currie has a beautiful line when she's interviewed by Jordan Peterson, and she says, Uh, Jordan Peterson is a famous, uh, podcaster here in Canada. The political cart was way ahead of the scientific cart from the very beginning.

The convention was signed before anything was confirmed scientifically. So that was my first surprise, okay? Okay! So, no science here in 1992, okay? And this figure of 1997 percent that [00:09:00] supposedly 97 percent of scientists agree that climate change is due to human activity. Now, people need to know that, well I didn't, it was totally fabricated.

It came from a paper by a cook. A cook, uh, person and, um, his name is Cook. And, uh, it comes from 2013 where the guy analyzes a, a 12,000 about climate related papers published between, let's say 91 and 2011. And he, cat, cat categorized the studies, uh, as either endorsing, rejecting, or having no opinion. The thing is, 66 percent of these abstracts Noted that they had no opinion.

So he put that aside. , this is amazing. He, this is supposed to be a scientist, right? He [00:10:00] put that aside and he said, okay, I'll work with the th the, the 33%. And among them, well there is 97% of the, the abstracts that mention that global warming is anthropogenic. Okay? So. That got quite, uh, uh, a buzz because the president at the time, Barack Obama, tweeted that in 2012, and so this is another quote of Judith Curry, it was an example of consensus entrepreneurship.

I just love this expression, I just love this expression, consensus in it. Entrepreneurship. Uh, it seems to me that we're inundated, you know, we're, we're drowning in consensus and entrepreneur, anyway. But, and she continues, but 97 percent is of a subset of abstracts. Cannot be interpreted as 97 percent of scientists.

Of course, you and me, we [00:11:00] understand that, right? So, nor did the paper refer to dangerous climate change. So, okay, that was my first whoa, whoa. Okay, let's, let's go on. So at the time of the summit, um, this is a quote by Bernie Lewin, which I need, I need to share because it's so delicious. And the quote is, it goes, it goes as follows.

The IPCC's dilemma at the time was this, it could not yet say scientifically what was dangerous anthropogenic interference because at yet it had no scientific confirmation of any interference at all. Now this is sweet. In the meantime, the nations could choose to act

without waiting for the science to catch up, which was entirely up to them.

But this would be a political decision. And there we see the political, [00:12:00] um, the, the political aspect of the IPCC, which is for boing, the, the, the, the, the author's report. Uh, was Bolin at the time, without a shift in the science to answer this question of what is dangerous, would be to step into the political.

So that was 1992, no science there.

The State of Climate Science Today

Joanne: Since then, still no consensus on the dangerousness of global warming. And chapter three and four in the book, you, you get out of that, that there, it's very difficult for the IPCC, still. To link dangerousness with global warming. Um, in fact more CO2. And that is something that we not, do not talk about enough, more.

CO2 could be seen as a good thing for plants, for biodiversity. And for me, this is me speaking there. The, the last point here for me, what is dangerous is. [00:13:00] Uh, the recklessness of the media that amplify alarmist claims, uh, and, uh, of the IPCC and the , uh, the, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the result of CO2 mitigation policies, that is dangerous to me to, uh, to recklessly undercover the benefits of CO2 and to amplify the alarmist claims.

Now talking about good things, um, there's this, um, there's this, uh, graph on the, uh, um, wait a minute. I can't see. Um, I'll just move my, my, I'll just move you to the left corner of my screen. It comes from the NASA Earth Observatory, uh, Observatory. in February 2020. Now what you see here are green areas and brown areas.

Now is it dangerous? [00:14:00] No, the planet is greening. Now where you see green is not where it is green. It is where it is greening. Good difference, uh, big difference. And so more CO2 is beneficial for nature. Additional CO2 in the air is good for plant growth. It is also good for agriculture, increasing the yields.

Now this is something we do not talk about enough, again. And so is global warming dangerous? Another graph here taken from False Alarm, uh, Bjorn Lomborg's. False alarm. And you see here that climate related and how could you measure dangerousness, right? You see, well, okay, well, I'll take deaths. And, and if you do that, you can reassure yourself because climate related deaths have plummeted by 96 percent since 1920, right?

And if you talk about dangerousness of the climate change and warming,

why not talk of dangerousness of [00:15:00] cold temperatures?
Because, and this, this another thing that amazed me, um, there's this study, uh, uh, globally, more than 5 million deaths per year, uh, are associated with non optimal temperatures. But guess what?

90 percent were cold related deaths. Now, I haven't read that in the media. Not at all. So, still, beware. We need to beware. Okay?

The Influence of Natural Phenomena on Climate

Joanne: Now, this is the fun part. Because the consensus seems to be that 100%, or mainly, the main factor in global warming is anthropogenic, right? They're man made.

These following graphs are fun because we can see, uh, the left graph illustrates the global sea level over 400, 000 years. [00:16:00] And you can see the variations over 100, 000 year periods. And it's fun because we could see at the end of this graph right here, at the end, very end, where it, You know, it goes up, and we're probably near the very up, uh, or the end of the, um, of this phase.

Um, but you could see that it varies. And at the second, the second, at the second graph to the right, you can see what, what is happening in terms of sea level, um, from 22, 000 years ago. And what's nice here is to see that when it warms, it warms really fast, and then whoops, it, it, you know, it, it,

more, more or less stable. So sea level has risen by about 400 feet, [00:17:00] uh, 22, 000 years ago. First, very rapidly until about 7, 000 years ago, when the rate of rise slowed dramatically. So there is climate change. I mean, you is indisputable. Climate change exists. It's indisputable. But still, is it essentially manmade?

And so that's the question. Here is a graph on the second slide. And here is a graph that, uh, that we, from which we could learn a lot. Also, it is a graph that represents what's happening since. 4, 000 4, 000 years ago. It is taken from the site CO2 coalition website. Really nice site that educates people on the role of CO2.

And the real debate is here. And we cannot say, we really can't say that there is consensus on this because there is debate. There are [00:18:00] alarmists out there, there are realists out there, there are CO2 lovers out there. I mean, there's a community of scientists, I'm not saying people like me, real scientists that love are realists in matters of CO2.

So the question is, is the recent warming period we are experiencing exceptional and easily caused by human, essentially caused, pardon me,

caused by human activities? So the alarmists would say, yes, the planet is boiling, there is an existential crisis, CO2 is the control knob of the climate. Simple, we are the bad guys, and let's attack CO2 and get rid of this.

Realists say no, this is not an exceptional period, and CO2 has an insignificant, if not a very modest, uh, Kunin uses this expression, very modest, That was the first influence on the [00:19:00] climate. So and significant warming periods as we can see on the graph on the left. Have occurred in the past and in the past, when you see the middle and warming period and the Roman period, you could see that these were a period that humanity had flourished.

You mean they were nice civilized civilizations in those periods. And you could also, um, You could also reason that you cannot blame the CO2 for these periods where there was significant climate warming, right? So visually, this graph, which would not be accepted by Michael Mann, of course, because we are, anyway, I'll close this parenthesis for now.

Um, so that, this is another thing, so there is, the lesson here is that there is debate, there is no consensus on the [00:20:00] anthropogenic cause, uh, essentially, essentially to, of, of global warming. So, uh, the debate is not settled, um, Stephen Coonan says until, and this is the most important part, I think, of, uh, it mo Most important lesson that I learned is that you need to to assess that to be so sure that anthropogenic causes is the number one, if not the essential cause of global warming, you need to untangle natural versus human influences.

And that is a big problem. It's a big problem. It's very, very difficult to do. So Kunin says until we can assess. all other natural influences on the climate, we cannot for sure assess the importance of human influence. It makes sense, doesn't it? And [00:21:00] so the question is, okay, can we assess? All other natural influences of the climate.

The answer is no. It's really complex and Judith Curry adds to that. The climate system is a long, non-linear, complex, and poorly understood in theory. In fact, the fact that global temperatures have increased since 1860 because they have increased and that humans have been adding CO2 in the atmosphere does not answer the question to what extent CO2, another human caused.

Emissions have dominated, have dominated over natural climate variability as the cause of recent warming. So this is where the debate is. This is where people are intimidated and called deniers. And this is where, if you mentioned that, You're a denier. Climate denier. That's too bad, because that's not science in any way.

That's not how I perceive science should be. And so [00:22:00] you have on the left, on the right of this slide, if you wonder what these phenomena, natural phenomena are, I mean, there are a lot, and there's a lot of unknowns, and there's a lot of unknown unknowns. I love that expression when I read it. We, there are things that we don't know.

We don't know. I mean, it's, it's, we're minuscule in, in this universe, right? And so variations in solar activity, the Milankovitch cycles, aerosols, clouds, water vapor, you name it. I mean, these natural phenomena are not insignificant. Um, so.

The Role of Computer Models in Climate Science

Joanne: Uh, well, that, that's science is not settled. The, the lesson is science.

No science is not settled. And I saw that you tweeted yesterday, uh, this graph on on, and I'm stealing your line here because I, I, [00:23:00] I found it so good. And this is a, a graph that, uh, is in Kunin unsettled. It illustrates the Colorado River flow over 1,200 years. Reconstructed, of course, and you can see where the arrows are, that there was significant drought in the past, um, that lasted many years, and you could, and your quote, and your quote on Twitter was Spot the CO2 induced drought crisis.

So we're in there. Where can we say CO2 influence the drought crisis in the year, let's say, 900, 10, 100. 1200 1600 difficult, right? So, um, but still, you can see how the press [00:24:00] treats this sort of information in May 2023. I quote, the Colorado River is threatened by over 20 years of drought worsened by global warming.

And then this year. How climate change is projected to alter California flooding. So climate is not weather. Hey, you, we could, we should always remember climate is not weather. Climate is not weather. So we, when we hear meteorologists on, on the TV and say, ah, my God, this is low. And it is accentuated by global warming.

No, climate is not weather. Bye. Um, probably, probably the, the, the media people find that click baiting is, you know, is profitable. So, let's go with that. Another example, and we're talking here about the relationship of natural variability and climate. We have here a beautiful [00:25:00] illustration of the relationship between the AMO oscillation and cyclones.

What is AMO? It's the Atlantic Multi Decadal, Multi Decadal Oscillation. What is that? Is that it is the psych cyclical changes in surface temperature in the North Atlantic oceans. And we can see here really the relationship between the two black line is a five year

average of the tropical cyclone count.

So there's really a, I mean, anyway, some people that look at that graph, you'd say, well, yeah, say sure. When there is a relationship between the two. And again, you could say, spot the CO2 induced influence, you know, so, so these are illustrations that talk a lot, um, make it difficult. They make it difficult to determine which observed changes in the climate are due to human influence and which are [00:26:00] not.

That, that's the lesson here. So, okay, uh, What I get out of the state of climate in reading these books is that climate science is very young and immature. Uh, you can see if you follow, uh, Judith Curry's or your tweets particularly, um, and, uh, you could see that new studies are pouring. Measurement tools are evolving.

There's still too many unknowns. Um, oh, yeah. And, and really what is really what's scandalizing is that the word accepted. Yeah. Um, there is no serious. Peer review process in the IPCC. There is a lot of cherry picking of studies by the IPCC. Some of them are not even published, if you believe, if you can believe that.

Uh, there are a lot of selection of time intervals [00:27:00] that confirmed, uh, preconceived idea. Uh, Roger Pielke has a, um, sub stack. Account and he delivers the news that he delivers. He analyzes really closely all this stuff about, um, extreme material, uh, material, uh, material phenomena and, and, uh, the climate and, and the warming.

And he does a really good job. So this is, this is where I'm I mentioned him a lot in chapter three. It's really convincing, really, really convincing. Um, and, uh, also there is a lot of misleading. Uh, the, they do some executive summary reports in the IPCC and sometimes is, it, it doesn't even illustrate what the reports have, uh, contain.

[00:28:00] So anyway, um, also highly political nature of the IPCC and. And I was amazed to see that climate science relies so much on computer models, um, having worked in, I mean, it was unimaginable to me that we could model climate. We can't even model, um, the financial systems, the financial system. And so, but But, uh, pretentiously as we are the human species, we imagine that we could model, we could use computer models to predict the future when these computer models cannot reproduce the past.

That's funny, isn't it? It cannot reproduce the past, but we are going to rely on these climate models to invest billions and trillions of [00:29:00] dollars. And to, yeah, to, uh, anyway, so, and there's this guy, this Richard Tall, one of the authors of the fifth IPCC report in 2013. And he says, when, when he ended his, his, uh, analysis, his report, um, what he proposed is to say that the worst impacts of

climate change are symptoms.

of underdevelopment and mismanagement. The most dramatic impacts of climate change are really symptoms of mismanagement and poverty and can be controlled if we had better governance and more development. Now that was not, that didn't go with The boss, the the IPCC boss and the United Nations and the [00:30:00] UNEP.

So it was not, it w that w that did, did not pass the test. And finally, um, Richard Tall, um, uh, he, he did not sign the summary Executive. Courageous. I thought he was very courageous to say, you know, but that's it. That's it. I mean, the alarmist tone was too much for him. And he didn't sign the executive summary of the IPCC in 2012, in 2013.

So we are what, 10 years later? Nothing's changed on that part.

The Net Zero Debate

Joanne: So let's go to the net zero. Is everything okay, Tom? Okay. About net zero and CO2. Again, there is a debate, there are all sorts of people, and I didn't put the CO2 lovers in there, I, I, because [00:31:00] CO2 lovers are also realists, you know, but they really love CO2, I mean, it's, for, for them, it's, the effect of the adding CO2 in the atmosphere is insignificant, and when I, when I, When I imagine CO2 lovers, I see Patrick Moore in my mind, the founder of Greenpeace, by the way, and so I see him, but still he's, he would, he would not, I guess he would not be, um, he would not be shy of saying that he's a realist.

Anyway, you have two camps here, the alarmists and the realists. So, on the part of the alarmist, the question is, is CO2 mitigation the solution, and is it even possible? So alarmists would say, yes, the planet is boiling, there is an existential crisis, imminent danger of catastrophe. The realists would say, no, this is not an exceptional period.

We saw in the [00:32:00] graph precedent, significant warming periods have occurred in the past. On the alarmist side, you would have, CO2 is the main driver of global warming, is the con is, CO2 is the control knob of climate, and the realist would say, no, CO2 is not the main driver of global warming, CO2 has a modest effect on a very complex climate system.

Contrasting Views on Climate Change

Joanne: Seriously, when I read these contrasts, and there are two others, I cannot understand the intelligent people not being. You know, uh, curious and saying, well, seems to me that realists, um, make sense. It makes sense to me, uh, because, uh, this climate thing is so complex and I'm so, I'm so minuscule in this universe and the past illustrates [00:33:00] the strong variability of climate and natural influences.

So, and to say today that humans can control the climate. A new CO2 as a control knob is absolutely, uh, deranged. I mean, anyway, let's let us continue. That was another parenthesis.

The Debate on Net Zero

Joanne: About net zero. What do the alarmists say about net zero? Well, yes, it is possible for 2050. We must rid ourselves from fossil fuels, and it is urgent.

Governments must be guided by the 2 degree and the 1.5 degree limits. On the other hand, realists would say, and they admit quite frankly now, and that that's nice that they admit it. It is not possible for, I mean, it's not possible. It's based on unrealistic assumptions. One of them is that, [00:34:00] uh, the, um, the consumption of energy.

Will plateau. Imagine that. There are many people, many populations around the world that are hungry for energy, but net zero is based on the unrealistic assumption that Very soon, I mean, there will be a plateau of energy consumption. But they say, uh, but good reason to, but the realists say, but there is good reason to migrate to less emitting CO2 sources of energy.

Climate Security: Alarmists vs Realists

Joanne: Okay, the last thing, the last, uh, the last, um, the last, uh, thing is how about climate security? Okay, the alarmist would say climate security should be prioritized at the price of adopting global degrowth policies, but no one, no nuclear and no natural gas. Okay. [00:35:00] The last line is where ideology could be, could, could be seen here.

When you say that climate security should be prioritized at the price of adopting global degrowth policies, you are, um, you are saying that a lot of countries will not have energy. Because I mean, they don't want fossil fuels. They don't want nuclear. They don't want natural gas. I personally cannot understand that reasoning.

What would the realists say? They would say they, well, they're realists. So energy security and global human well being It should be evidently prioritized over climate security and, and you have governments right now that are being confronted by their populations. And this is, uh, climate security, uh, climate security, uh, I [00:36:00] mean, goes, uh, goes nowhere if you, you deny access to energy to your population and for the realist nuclear and natural gas.

are good alternatives. So that's the big contrast to say that there is consensus is false, is untrue. There is debate. And personally, I'm joined by the realists.

The Threat of Global Institutions

Joanne: If you want to be really alarmed, Um, a dog, the dogma, the dogmatic manner in which the IPCC and world leaders treat the climate science, um, well still filled with uncertainties and risk and unknowns.

Um, that's scary. I mean, for me, that's scary. I was, I was educated by the nuns when I was young. And religion then. All that [00:37:00] was really good and fine, I mean, in 1960, but I mean, is science becoming a religion when you cannot, when, when you cannot contest, when you cannot ask questions, when you cannot doubt, um, the use of intimidation that is censorship, uh, and I'm sure that your listeners have a name in their head right now, uh, transforming defamation suits into free speech.

Um, example. Oh, I did say it. Um, uh, well, for example, the man versus Stein, the media bias and censorship. Um, is that really science? Um, if you really want to be alarmed, the real threat for me is how very powerful global and non elected institutions can easily [00:38:00] dictate and dictate. destructive and very costly climate policies to the entire world.

Think about that. They were not elected, these people. And that's with so little cost benefit analysis. It's astounding that we let people dictate what is to be, uh, what is to be, um, our energy policies. Um, it's astounding to me.

The Misuse of Climate Change by Governments

Joanne: Um, if you want to be alarmed how climate change offers an escape route for Irresponsible governments, because now, of course, everything is due to climate change.

They are not responsible of anything. And, and that's it. I mean, so, and the leniency and complicity of the fourth estate. Too busy, crying wolf. Rather than doing its homework, I'm [00:39:00] really displeased with the, with the, with the media regarding climate change. Really, really displeased. And all of these authors have many pages in their book where they, where they quote, um, titles of article, you know, and they, they're really, they're really, um, um, Disappointed.

The Role of Central Banks and Investment Funds

Joanne: Another thing you could be alarmed about is how the central banks and investment funds participate in the United Nations transformational change agenda. That scares me. Also, the industrial cronyism and all these Forcings to recuperate the term in climate that change science.

The Real Threats to Climate

Joanne: Forcings may not end well, um, so if you want to be alarmed, there are full reasons to be alarmed, but it is not CO2.

It isn't.

The Debate on Anthropogenic Factors

Joanne: So, my conclusion, um, after reading all this, after thinking [00:40:00] about it, after talking to these people, some of them, um, there is no consensus on how important the anthropogenic factor is. On the contrary, um, there is debate, there is fierce debate. That is a good thing. Okay. We're we're talking about science here.

Uh, climate change is not an existential threat to the planet, nor to humans. Uh, the recent, the Clint Tell report is really, is really, uh, instructive in that way. They, uh, the recent slight warming following a little ice age. Remember that? There was a little ice age, uh, not too long ago and so maybe it's not too alarming that there is a warming, a slight warming period after that, right?

Um, it could, yeah, so also the urgency sales pitch of the climate activists denies everyone, oh that, that's another thing.

The Unrealistic Assumptions of Net Zero

Joanne: Since it's [00:41:00] urgent, I mean, really urgent to come up with a solution. Um, well, we as citizens, um, we are denied of having an intelligent, comprehensive and economically viable solutions.

We say, no, no, no, don't, don't, don't think about it. Don't, don't, don't, don't think about it. I mean, we're in the right, we're in our right here to impose our solutions and the solution is CO2 mitigation. Um, but, um, yeah. About net zero, the outright elimination of fossil fuels is a delusion, for the many reasons outlined in the book.

Uh, CO2 is neither a thermostat nor a control knob that can control Earth's climate. Um, on the moral issue, uh, degrowth is not. An option? Degrowth is [00:42:00] not an option.

The Immorality of Denying Energy Access

Joanne: And denying developing countries access to cheap, reliable energy is immoral. All these people say the same thing. Um, Jordan Peterson is, is really inflamed.

I don't know if the word exists in English, but inflamed. When he speaks to Conan, when he speaks to all these people, uh, do the curry, his podcasts were really informative for me. Um, uh, they, they, they, they are appalled. They are appalled about the immoral aspect of degrowth. Um, and, uh, it's good to know that people can express, uh, can express that freely still until, until, yeah.

The Hijacking of Environmental Concerns

Joanne: So, uh, another thing, time to get back, it, it is time to get back to basics, uh, uh, when I was little, when you talked about the environment, you talked about Clean air. [00:43:00] You talked about water and land and taking care of nature's biodiversity. Who is talking about that anymore? No, it's been hijacked. The, this, this, this environment has been hijacked by, um, by CO2, by, by CO2 craze, the CO2 craze, the net zero craze.

Adopting adaptation policies and opting for growth and economic development for all, especially poorer countries, that, that is what we should do. So it's time to take example from the authors. I present in this book humility and great sensibility in front of so many, so much complexity, uncertainties, and risks.

When you explore the Earth, the climate, and the changes that have occurred over millions of years, If you're, I mean, If you're sensible

to, you, you can't help, help but [00:44:00] wonder, I mean, you can't help but doubt and want to question because this is a beautiful, a beautiful, um, it could be a beautiful science, I mean, I understand scientists that are not quite pleased by how things are going in the scientific community and the bitching and you know, but that's too, that's really, that's really sad.

Anyway, um, we could be encouraged. Uh, I, I don't want to leave you with a, you know, a, a pessimistic cloud outlook. Um, there is an increase in legitimate doubt. You were asking that question to your Um, president, um, invitee, uh, Tom, and I think, I think, I think we can, we can see in an increase in legitimate, legitimate doubt, uh, people now take to the street.

So governments are squeezed. They [00:45:00] must reassess their net zero. We're seeing that, especially in Great Britain. And, um, in, um, In, uh, and mine in Germany, in Germany, uh, more and more independent studies. I think the IBCC is going to be challenged. I think, I think personally that we will see, uh, competitors, uh, new peer review publishing sites.

Maybe, um, a good thing is that somebody like me could access, um, information. Alternative media platforms do a really good job your platform, for example, and the IPCC is being challenged. Net zero is being challenged. Clean and renewable energies are being challenged. Are they really clean? Are they really reliable, renewable?

And, um People, I think people are asking for a more realistic transition and natural gas is recognized by the United, by the [00:46:00] European Union as a green energy source and nuclear power is getting more and more acceptable. Anyway, we talk about it more. So yeah, I think, I think we need, yeah. So this was my effort.

In in participating in the on the knowledge front, maybe or on the reassuring front.

The Need for Humility and Skepticism

Joanne: Um, there are lessons to be learned while reading these authors. Um, the consensus is very lean. Uh, yes, temperatures have been warming. The burning of fossil fuels have added to the CO₂, of course. But other than that, no consensus on some element, on some elements of the CO₂, of the so called consensus.

There's no consensus on the 97 percent. There's no consensus on the dangerousness of climate change. There's no Consensus [00:47:00] on the anthropogenic sole responsibility of the recent warming. There's no consensus on net zero at all. So, that's a lesson I think that we

should take up. Humility, to have humility in the face of uncertainties and risk.

Um, should be the mantra, should be really the mantra of the United Nations and the IPCC. If they want to be useful, um, intimidation and censorship should stop now. I mean, we're intelligent beings here, now we could, you know, accept or reject. Some of what people say, uh, I prefer, um, being confident in people, uh, versus big administrative bureaucracies and, uh, uh, non elected officials, uh, uh, this is me.

Okay, maybe you're not, but I guess you're, you're, you should be like me because, [00:48:00] uh, you listen to Tom. Nelson's podcast. Um, another lesson.

The Danger of Good Intentions

Joanne: Beware of the grand Geo's transformational change agenda. It is based on the growth agenda, immoral, immoral for populations that are desperately need a regular low cost and reliable energy sources.

The people I read, I mean, they use these words, echo colonial, colonialism, colonialism. Eco imperialism, sustainable poverty, green colonialism, doomsday imperialism. All these words that could define this transformational change agenda. It's nothing, it's nothing less than that. Beware of good intentions. I'm allergic to good intentions.

I'm a skeptic by nature and you need to be, people need to be allergic to [00:49:00] it, especially when there is no cost benefit analysis. Um, we are owed such exercises by our government. So, ask. Doubt is wealthy, is healthy.

The Importance of Doubt and SkepticismThe Misconceptions about Climate Change

Joanne: Skepticism is healthy. Um, questioning, bringing nuance is healthy. It has nothing, nothing to do with denialism.

The catchphrase denialism, it's, it's, it's, no, no. Um, beware of the media. They are activists. They lack curiosity and understand that this battle, if you can say that, is not between a benevolent left and a super capitalist demonizing right. It's not that at all, because when you see what they try to do, they [00:50:00] are not resolving poverty in the world at all.

So. That was my contribution. Get back to, uh, to real politics, uh, real politic, uh, and, um, beware.

Tom: I just want to read some quotes from your book that I had highlighted here. We are just tiny ants in an infinitely large universe and on a planet whose climate is influenced by a multitude of natural phenomena that we barely understand. I think that's well put.

Do you have any more to expand

Joanne: on that? Well, what I would add to that is that anything. else of being doubtful and having a curious scientific mind would be presumptuous. It would be presumptuous to say that we understand all this and that we can impose on poor countries a [00:51:00] transformational agenda that would deny them the right to low cost energy because that's what's happening.

Yeah.

Tom: Uh, next quote is, uh, you talked about this incident where, uh, we were told that the Amazon is the lungs of the earth, and a Schellenberger contacted one of the IPCC, I believe, lead authors to ask about that quote, and the author said, quote, it's bullshit. There's no science behind that. The Amazon produces a lot of oxygen, but it uses the same amount of oxygen through respiration.

So it's a wash. That was a high profile thing, right? Lungs of the earth, blah, blah, blah.

Joanne: The lungs of the earth, the polar bears, uh, extinction. Um, all that was, is disinformation. It really is. And it does not come from where they tell us this information comes from. It comes from people that have an agenda also, and that story.

And I mean, when I. [00:52:00] Talk to, I have a girl and, uh, two little ones, well two little ones, they're 25 and 21 years old, I mean, my, my granddaughters, but, but I said they're little ones, they're for me, they'll always be little ones, and so, but, and when I told them that I would write a book and Well, the first thing that came to mind is, yeah, well, what about the polar bears and the Amazon farm?

The first thing. And so I wasn't to tell them, no, no, that's, that's, I mean, I, it's, it's appalling how young people are being disinformed and they suffer echo anxiety right now. It's immoral. I mean, this, it's junk. When they talk about junk science, that's it. That, that's, that, if you, yeah, if you want to talk about junk science, that will be great examples.

So you mentioned

Tom: polar bears. You have another great paragraph about them. You

say, the real threat to many species is not climate change. According to Lomborg, it's humans. From Lomborg, he [00:53:00] says, still today, some 700 polar bears are killed by hunters each year. If we want to help polar bears, why, why not stop shooting them, he concludes.

Joanne: Yeah. Isn't that a great, uh, that isn't, it may mean it makes sense. Doesn't it? And right now, thank you. It has results, not killing polar bears. I imagine that it helps the species. I mean, uh, yeah. So, but, uh, Susan Crockford has a great little book that explains all this. And it was really informative for me.

And, and young people could, uh, could read that, uh, could read the book. And I, uh, I quoted in, in, in my book, I think.

Tom: Uh, another, uh, quote here from Schellenberger in Apocalypse Never, uh, quote, anyone who believes climate change could kill billions of people and cause civilizations to collapse might be surprised to discover that none of the IPCC reports contain a single apocalyptic scenario.[00:54:00]

Nowhere does the IPCC describe developed nations like the United States becoming a, quote, climate hell resembling the Congo. So, again, a good, uh, you've done a great job of digging into what everyone else has written and pulling out the great quotes.

Joanne: Yeah. Yeah. For Schellenberger to say that, I mean, it's, it's important because it, uh, illustrates the difference, what happens to the IPCC, um, report done by the scientists.

And then it goes up a layer and then there's politics involved and then there's Antonio Guterres. Is that comes out with Okay, the planet is boiling and we're all you know, well, but, um, and that that that is a really important part. We should denounce that. I mean, I can't understand why climate scientists accept that.

And I honor Richard told from for, you know, getting away from from signing a summary report that didn't reflect at all what was in Okay. The reports are the, uh, [00:55:00] I mean, it goes to say, it goes to say how much you could, on these summary reports. Yeah. They're very political.

Tom: Okay. Yeah. I apologize for wanting to read your entire book into this podcast, but it is excellent work. And I can't believe I didn't know who you were until recently. I'm a little sad about that, that, uh, no, I consider myself all plugged in.

I'm reading about this stuff all the time and it's amazing to me that I had not heard of you until recently. And

Joanne: well, the book was launched in November last year. Uh, it is a, I mean, I am French Canadian, so, uh, the, um, the population here knows about it. Um, the mainstream media does not want to know about it, but they received the book.

Nonetheless, but, um, yeah, people that know me. And they, they really supported me, so I'm going on these podcasts and, and, but this is the first one [00:56:00] in English. I mean, I hope there'll be a second, but it means this is big for me. I mean, launching a podcast in English, maybe it'll help. To, uh, to, to get out, get the book out there.

Tom: Yeah. Okay. So I feel a little better now because maybe it's the problem is I don't speak French and maybe that's why. Okay. Another highlight here. A Lomborg illustrates the rising cost phenomenon with a hurricane that hit Miami in 1940 reaching 24, 000 homes. Today, the same hurricane would hit more than 1 million homes.

This whole idea of, oh no, there's more damage now, the hurricanes must be worse now, not true, right?

Joanne: Right, not true, and this is where Bjorn Lomborg and Pico worked together in saying that, um, you cannot use Cost explosion expose explosive costs of, um, climate related that damage because [00:57:00] when you consider the, uh, you know, the, the P I, the, the, um, when you take into account it, All what is calculated in that use, you can see that the costs are going down.

So, uh, that, that's, and again, you have to deprogram what you're being told or what you're, you're told by the, by the media. All right. There's nothing but numbers. There's nothing but numbers to do the job.

Tom: I'll just include one last nugget here. And then people have to read the rest of your book to get all the rest of them here.

The Misrepresentation of Climate Change Impact ---

Tom: Uh, you have a, uh, We have a table here, uh, listing events and detection and attribution, like tropical cyclones. Oh, yeah. There's no detection, no attribution to humans. Uh, extra tropical cyclones, hurricanes, tornadoes, winter storms, hail, extreme winds are all listed here. And then you say, admit that you are surprised that there is neither detection of a change nor attribution to human activity for all of these events listed.

I think that is [00:58:00] incredibly key that, uh, you've, uh, made a table about that and for us to

Joanne: panic over. Yeah. This is, this is Pcal speaking. This is p uh, peel key, peel key speaking, uh, on his substack. I, I read all that. He did, yeah, he did in the last, uh, few years on, on climate and his readings of how he interprets the IPCC reports.

He's, he's a really good teacher. This one. They're all good teachers, by the way, and they, well. They're all good teachers because I could understand them and I have no background in climatology. So, so this is a great, uh, this is a great compliment that I, I, and I. I thank them. I thank them a lot because I'm, uh, I admire very much people that could teach me things and transmit their passion for what they study.

And so, um, yeah, uh, if you have, um, to your listeners, if you have people in your [00:59:00] environment that are eco anxious and that, you know, they, they shy away from, Um, young youngsters and, um, I, I, I think my book is accessible to everyone and it would be a great gift, uh, to give them. So that's my gift to you.

Totally

Tom: agree with that. Uh, any other points you'd like to make here before we wrap up this one for today?

Joanne: Um, since you're reading, uh, since you're reading, um, I'll, I'll read you one. Um, okay. Because people think that it's a left and right battle. Right? It's not. So no, this is no longer a left that cares about humanity's well being, the environment, and all living species.

The Radical Agenda of Net Zero Activists

Joanne: We're dealing here with a new, extremely influential class of activists and upstarts, [01:00:00] trained for 40 years in the ideology of climate catastrophism. Some call it climatism. Let's call the net zero activists what they are. Radicals who meet with no resistance from political and media elites, who have chosen to be complicit in a display of green virtue rather than do their job.

What motivates them has little to do with improving the quality of life of humans and the environment. On the contrary, such a non compromising vision inevitably leads to an agenda of degrowth and sustainable poverty, renamed transformational change. And this is the world we're designing here, they're designing.

Controls, regulations, green taxes, violation of private property, a property. We have here in Canada, Mr. Justin Trudeau, just, just, uh,

I mean, [01:01:00] the, uh, this, this new law, C63, I mean, it's appalling. Um, anyway, okay. Um, new monitoring and surveillance bureaucracies, even censorship and public condemnation of People expressing dissenting opinions.

This is where the vision promoted by the United Nations and its IPCC is taking us.

Conclusion: Rejecting the Vision of Sustainable Poverty

Joanne: Degrowth for some, sustainable poverty for others. I choose to reject that.

Tom: So this proves that great minds think alike because I, I had highlighted that very part. It was in my list of things to bring up here. Great stuff.

You go on in a couple more paragraphs to say the single goal of eliminating all fossil fuels may be easy to sell to school children, but adults should know that things aren't that simple. Great stuff.

Joanne: Yeah. Yeah. Well, thanks a lot. I can't thank you enough, uh, Tom. It was really challenging for me because I think in French, right, [01:02:00] but um, and the support, the PowerPoint support was really helpful for me.

So I, I hope, um, I hope, uh, I hope people, um, liked

Tom: it. I'm sure they will. So thank you very much. I hope to have you on again if you have some more time. Thank you very much.