

Net Zero Carbon – “Your Country Needs You!” aka “The Constancy of Purpose”

written by Steve Mackowski | February 23, 2023

That’s right. Your country needs you! Because it is every one of you (us) that needs to contribute to the goal of Net Zero Carbon if there is to be any chance of reaching the goal. Note here that it doesn’t really matter if you believe (or I believe) that the goal is attainable. What does matter is that if the goal is to be reached then the discussion below is how it can be achieved.

Since this is [Article 6 in my series](#) and I am expecting it to be the last, I wanted to do something catchy, hence Uncle Sam. But what I really want to highlight is almost the name of the next James Bond or Mission Impossible film – “The Constancy of Purpose”. The most important aspect of the whole approach. I’ll get back to that.

So, your mission, should you choose to accept, is to be part of the solutions that need to be achieved for the goal of Net Zero Carbon to be attained. This message will not self-destruct after 30 seconds, so you don’t have to hurry. You can re-read before you commit. And when I say to be part of, I mean actively engaged. It’s your part of “The Constancy of Purpose”.

1. Nuclear power. Any new additional power requirements of any size are to be provided by nuclear power. Any replacement power following a fossil-fuelled power station shutting down must be provided by nuclear power. Why? As previously demonstrated there will simply be not enough

[Critical Minerals](#) developed to supply our power needs from the renewables sector. There will also not be enough [STEM graduates](#) to fulfill the resources required. So, you have to be actively engaged in the development or expansion of the nuclear power solution.

2. Solar power. You have to accept that large scale remotely located solar power is a waste of the limited resources highlighted. There is not enough lithium to make enough solar panels. The need to co-develop long transmission systems and battery back-ups is an inefficient use of resources. Rooftop solar is fine as it fits into existing infrastructure, but a solar farm in the center of Australia with 1,000 kms of new high voltage power lines. Methinks not. And using the power to produce hydrogen! Well, let's get it straight. No government subsidies are allowed anywhere in this discussion. If it isn't self-sufficient economically, it isn't a solution. It's part of the problem.
3. Wind power. Another huge waste of limited resources for the same reasons as above. Magnets are better utilized elsewhere. End of story.
4. Electric cars. The symbol of inner city wokeism. I'll only browse here. Just imagine the upgrade to your district's electricity network needed to charge even 20% of electric cars. Just imagine who is going to pay for the upgrade of the apartment block's electrical system to accommodate a significant increase in demand. Many thousands of dollars per apartment! Is it an efficient use of resources to span our countries with additional electricity transmission infrastructure? Resources are short remember! So, stick to your guns (oops, cars). OK. I'll let you have a hybrid!
5. Human Resources. Once we have the issues above well planned and in train, we can then define the [STEM needs](#) to achieve the goal. All levels of our education systems need

to change. And you have to be part of that. Whether as a parent or grandparent, or maybe just a concerned voter influencing our governments, we have to fix this. You have to encourage your children, you have to lobby the governments. The volume of STEM graduates needs to dramatically expand and be focussed. “The Constancy of Purpose” again.

Now sure, everyone has their part to play, but tokenism is not healthy. As [reported](#) in The Australian Newspaper, Sunday, February 12, 2023, by Robyn Ironside, is having the “greenest” airline really that important? When the solution requires orders of magnitude more production of “sustainable”, but still carbon dioxide emitting fuel at increased costs?

These “solutions” are wokeisms in play. Change the definition of sustainability and it becomes OK. Well, that is not acceptable. Net Zero Carbon is a real goal and is not to be fudged. I get pretty enraged when I read that EU power stations are burning purposely grown “wood waste” instead of coal and claiming zero carbon emissions. This is fixing the books, not fixing the problem.

“The Constancy of Purpose”

“The Constancy of Purpose”. Who does this apply to? Well, if the world is going to achieve the Net Zero goal, well then, the world needs to have “The Constancy of Purpose”. LOL sorry, couldn’t help it. The developed world and the developing world are streets apart here. Only the developed world is chasing the goal. The developed world wants the developing world to also chase the Net Zero goal. But how can they? In a resource-constrained world, do you really think that the developed world will allow those limited resources to be deployed in developing

countries?

Maybe they should if the overall balance to Net Zero indicates that is the most resource-effective answer. Methinks not going to happen. Our political classes are too focused on their own political survival (and ideological orientation) to let valuable resources out of their grasp. That got me thinking about how to determine resource utilization effectiveness on a global scale. Another time, another series. But it will come to that distribution question. Why? Because there will come a time when the developing countries will see that they are being starved of resources by the developed world to attempt to meet their own Net Zero goals. And sorry developing world, you can't have any! Not a pleasant thought.

So, what chance Net Zero? [An article](#) from The Australian newspaper, also on Sunday, February 12, 2023, by well-acknowledged editor, Greg Sheridan, seems to present the argument that is most often proffered.

Net Zero Carbon?

Again. Very negative. My views on Net Zero Carbon? The Critical Minerals developments needed can be addressed. Will take a major shift in Government approvals timing though. The choice of power technology to be nuclear focussed is again achievable but will take some guts from some governments. The Human Resources issue is again achievable, but it would mean the end of the woke revolution in our education system. Achievable yes, in practice – No!

Net Zero Carbon by 2050 on a global scale? No chance! The emissions from the developing world will continue to grow. They will not have access to the resources needed. Well, how about on a local scale, by Country say? In the US or Australia, or the

EU? “The Constancy of Purpose” test gives me no confidence. Twenty-five years of focussed efforts to achieve a goal that not even a majority of the population understands, acknowledges, or prioritizes? Methinks not.

We will just have to advance at a pace that results from ignoring the requirements that could move toward the answers. No wonder the Cheshire Cat has such a wide grin!

However, if you still want to do your bit in the Net Zero challenge, remember. “The Constancy of Purpose” may be coming to a theatre near you. So, thanks to movie-world for the license and to Forrest for the end quote: “Well, that’s all I have to say about that.”