

**LETTERS TO EDITOR
GLOBAL WARMING, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY**

Letters To Editor –2023–24

In the boxes below are letters in 2023 and 2024 to the Editor of the Canberra Times, Canberra City News and The Australian about the ongoing zeitgeist that is global warming, climate change, the related energy crisis and the debate about the sustainability of renewable energy.

The new federal Labor and Greens government will learn the hard way that their position on climate change and emission reduction targets are based on ideology and not on reality.

Remember! No matter what Australia does to reduce CO2 emissions, at about 1.1% of world emissions, it can have zero effect on global warming let alone climate change.

Our priority should be on climate-proofing the country, not wasting billions on ineffective, ideological policies at great expense to taxpayers.

M.R. Flint
Principal, Australian Logistics Study Centre
1May 2024

City News [published, 24Apr24] ‘Economic and engineering reality’ no one can estimate In rejecting the need for nuclear energy Eric Hunter (Letters, CN April 18) is assuming that the Australian Energy Market Operator plans to meet the national energy generation requirements at net zero emissions, solely with a wind and solar mix of clean energy generation, will work at the projected cost or even work at all. The “economic and engineering reality” is that no one can estimate how much it would cost to firm the supply at net zero emissions, without nuclear energy. Mr Hunter is probably correct that the left would cut off their nose to spite their face by ensuring “a long time before our present laws banning nuclear could be changed”. He is incorrect that reactors should be located “close to large population areas”. All current large dispatchable energy sources and those proposed are remote from population centres. John L Smith, Farrer
Canberra Times [published, 24Apr24] The Canberra Times Fossil fuel exports Eric Hunter (letters 19Apr24), please spare me your sanctimonious claptrap about Australia needing to set an example to the world on emissions reductions. Australia only needs to do its fair share, which it has been doing for over a decade, and not shoot itself in the foot economically, which it is now doing, in trying to shut-down a major source of our nation’s wealth. M. Flint Erindale Centre 19Apr24 Editor’s Note: Original letter redacted as shown. This letter was endorsed by Bob MacDonald, in a letter to the editor, 26April 2024. Unfortunately, Mr MacDonald’s letter could not be copied from the Canberra Times today, as is normally possible.
The Canberra Times Faulty Renewables Logic Dr Douglas Mackenzie (Letters, 22Apr24) seems to have lost the plot and let his ideological bias get in the way of his economic logic, in saying that rooftop solar savings of \$1,390 to \$1,560a year denies the Albanese government's "broken promise" of a \$275 a year due to its renewables policy. First, he does not mention the substantial family investment

<p>required for rooftop solar. Second, there is no connection between rooftop solar (here already for decades) and the nation-wide push by Labor/Greens for renewable energy, to which the claimed \$275 a year saving refers.</p> <p>M. Flint Erindale Centre 22Apr24</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published, 19Apr24]</p> <p>An Old Refrain</p> <p>"When, oh when" are we going to turn off the scratchy old record about Australia not being able to make a difference to global warming (Letters, April 10)? We can set an example by not only reducing our own emissions, but by also producing emission-free products.</p> <p>Eric Hunter, Cook</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published, 18Apr24]</p> <p>Listen to Dick</p> <p>Dick Smith has taken out adverts in national newspapers to highlight the failure of successive governments to produce a population plan that would cater for the limits of growth that are dictated by our fragile soils, water scarcity and climate change.</p> <p>It is an issue that concerns the majority of our population but one ignored by the major parties and the Greens and alarmingly very few politicians, including my local member, will reply to my letters on this topic.</p> <p>Don Owers, Dudley, NSW</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published, 10Apr24]</p> <p>Not That Simple</p> <p>Considering that Australia is the world's third-largest exporter of fossil fuels (after Russia and Saudi Arabia), contrary to M. Flint's assertion (Letters, April 10), were we to "disappear off the map tomorrow", we would undoubtedly make a difference to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Patricia Saunders, Chapman</p> <p>Editor's Note: See letter below, dated 10Apr24</p>
<p>City News [published, 10Apr24]</p> <p>Only in Australia is nuclear power political</p> <p>Sue Dyer's comments (Letters, CN March 28) are typical of the anti-nuclear brigade still living in the 1980s. They want net zero by 2050, but the science tells us it can't be done without nuclear energy in the mix. Wasn't this the side of politics always telling us to believe the science about global warming?</p> <p>They want carbon dioxide-free emissions and that is exactly what nuclear provides, but they prefer some scaremongering from the 1980s. It is also baseload power that provides electricity 100 per cent of the time and is not dependent on the weather, unlike renewables that are lucky to provide power 20 per cent of the time. A nuclear power plant would last a lifetime, renewables are lucky to last 20 years.</p> <p>Only in Australia is nuclear power political, with the Labor/Greens locked in some time warp of anti-nuclear hysteria while in other countries it is bipartisan and even in places such as Finland, the Greens are on board.</p> <p>Australia is ideal for nuclear; plenty of flat stable land with plentiful uranium and we already bury nuclear waste from other countries, not to mention a nuclear reactor in Sydney that provides anti-cancer medicine that has never blown up in its 60 years and no major incidents.</p> <p>We are also getting nuclear subs in SA that Labor likes to talk up but seem to bury their heads in the sand when you mention nuclear power. Strange indeed.</p> <p>The Labor energy minister must have felt very lonely at COP28 where 22 world leaders signed a declaration to triple nuclear by 2050.</p> <p>Maybe the ACT and its politicians could advocate for nuclear power in the territory, as former Liberal Prime Minister John Gorton did back in 1971. That way we would pull our own weight and not rely on the 80 per cent of electricity we draw from NSW coal and gas plants, or does Sue believe, like most rusted on Labor voters here, that the ACT gets its electricity from 100 per cent renewable energy?</p> <p>Ian Pilsner, Weston</p>
<p>City News [published, 10Apr24]</p> <p>Simple rationale for Opposition's nuclear policy</p>

<p>If Sue Dyer (Letters, CN March 28) looked at the energy generation make-up around the world she would see that there is a simple rationale for the Coalition’s policy of developing nuclear energy.</p> <p>It has not been demonstrated that a wind and solar mix of clean energy can meet energy generation requirements.</p> <p>The only countries with significant levels of emissions and a high per cent of clean energy generation are Canada and Brazil (using hydro) and France (using nuclear).</p> <p>John L Smith, Farrer</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published, 10Apr24]</p> <p>We Make No Difference</p> <p>When, oh when, are letter writers like Brian Measday and Anne O’Hara (Letters, April 8) ever going to realise that Australia could disappear off the map tomorrow and not make one scrap of difference to global warming let alone climate change?</p> <p>M Flint, Erindale Centre</p> <p>Editor’s Nore: Submitted version below.</p> <p>Fossil fuel exports</p> <p><i>When, oh when, are letter writers like Brian Measday and Anne O’Hara (Letters, 8Apr24) ever going to realise that Australia could disappear off the map tomorrow and not make one scrap of difference to global warming let alone permanent climate change? The Labor/Greens governments are wasting \$billions for zero effect.</i></p> <p><i>I do not question Anne O’Hara’s figures about deaths from air pollution or that the deaths may be caused by increasing air pollution due to weather conditions, but our response should be to prepare for such emergencies and not waste \$millions on useless emissions reduction, let alone the killing of our crucial fossil fuel exports.</i></p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 2Apr24]</p> <p>The Australian [Published 1Apr24]</p> <p>Solar Panel subsidies</p> <p>PM Albanese has promised \$1billion to subsidise solar panel manufacturing capability in the Hunter Valley. There is no way Australia could manufacture such panels cheaper than China. Without a balancing tariff on Chinese imports, most Australian home owners will opt for the cheapest panels and substantial taxpayer subsidies will be needed forever. One is reminded of the days when taxpayers subsidised Holdens and Falcons by over \$5,000 per vehicle, before the plug was pulled in favour of imports.</p> <p>M. Flint</p> <p>Canberra</p> <p>31Mar24</p>
<p>The Australian</p> <p>Solar Panel subsidies</p> <p>PM Albanese has promised \$1billion to subsidise the creation of a solar panel manufacturing capability in the Hunter Valley. Where will this lead? Given that there is no way Australia could manufacture such panels cheaper than China, that it is extremely unlikely that this Labor government would slap a balancing tariff on Chinese imports (already over 80% of panel consumption), and that Australian home owners will opt for the cheapest panels, then any such capability will require substantial taxpayer subsidies forever. Back to the good old days when taxpayers were subsidising Holdens and Falcons to the tune of over \$5,000 per vehicle, because of union featherbedding, before the plug was pulled on the industry in favour of imports.</p> <p>That said, there is always a case to subsidise a critical supply industry. One may think there is such as case for solar panels, as important to the national grid at present, but in 20 years’ time when old panels have been found to be a destructive influence on our landscape and agricultural productivity, especially if nuclear energy is available, as it will be of necessity? The long-term future for panels and turbines is bleak and, consequently, \$1billion could be put to better use by the government.</p> <p>Also note that we have a few billionaire carpet baggers waiting to hook into the taxpayer cash cow.</p> <p>M. Flint</p> <p>Canberra</p> <p>30Mar24</p>
<p>The Australian</p>

<p>Carpethbagger</p> <p>Why can't I seem to shake the feeling that Andrew Forrest, aided and abetted by Minister Bowen, with access to taxpayer billions, is shaping up to be the greatest carpetbagger this country has ever seen?</p> <p>M. Flint Canberra 12Jan23</p>
<p>Canberra Times</p> <p>In the 29 December CT Eric Hunter labelled all those like me who question the human role in climate change as 'deniers' and advised us to follow the Sceptics advice to 'seek the evidence'.</p> <p>Rather than list all areas in doubt, perhaps Eric could enlighten us on why, in pre-human times, there were severe ice ages, why for 80% of time the planet was so hot there were no ice caps, why he believes CO2 acts like Earth's thermostat when geological records show no consistent past correlation with CO2 levels, why he believes the sun, seas and clouds are unimportant when they play known and obvious roles and why our current forecast hot dry summer so far has been cool and wet?</p> <p>That should prove who the real deniers and sceptics are.</p> <p>Doug Hurst, 3Jan24</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published, 2Jan24]</p> <p>Sceptical About Sceptics</p> <p>Eric Hunter (Letters December 29) calls Doug Hurst and his ilk climate change "sceptics". They are not.</p> <p>As a card-carrying member of the Australian Skeptics (motto: Seek the evidence), I can assure Eric that sceptics (spell it how you will) know full well that the evidence for human-induced climate change is overwhelming. Doug Hurst and his fellow travellers are climate change deniers, not sceptics. The two are opposite ends of the intellectual spectrum.</p> <p>Fred Pilcher, Kaleen</p>
<p>Canberra Times published, 30Dec23</p> <p>Ignorance is bliss</p> <p>Doug Hurst (Letters, December 26) cites "the BOM's inability to forecast North Queensland weather a day ahead" as justification for the tired old joke about a "not for prophet organisation".</p> <p>He then recites the tired old line about thinking it possible to "forecast climate change decades ahead" and having the government believe it.</p> <p>Mr Hurst fails to understand the nature of either weather or climate. Climate change is a consequence of global heating, which occurs over decades, centuries, and even longer periods.</p> <p>Global heating causes warming of the oceans and the atmosphere. A consequence of the former is increased evaporation, humidity and rainfall. A consequence of the latter is increased atmospheric turbulence, which makes weather forecasting more difficult. The BOM is doing its best in difficult circumstances.</p> <p>Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>
<p>Canberra Times</p> <p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>In Friday's CT Felix MacNeill and Eric Hunter both question my knowledge of weather and climate. That is their right, but many facts tell me there is no human induced climate emergency.</p> <p>Although the world has warmed by about 1.5C since the late 1800s we are no warmer than 1000 years ago, still cooler than in Roman times and the previous 8 000 years, and much warmer than most of the previous 100 000 years when orbital variations created an ice age that locked up ice at the poles and dropped sea levels some 120 metres..</p> <p>Geologists also tell that there is no consistent correlation between CO2 and past climate and 80% of time Earth was so much warmer than now that there were no ice caps. Dinosaurs lived in Antarctica and life flourished everywhere.</p> <p>Volcanic activity greatly influenced past climate and today the 2022 Hunga Tonga Pacific eruption increased stratosphere water vapour levels enough to contribute to our wet and cool December 2023.</p> <p>There has been no increase in the frequency and intensity of things like droughts and cyclones, both of which produced worse times in the late 1800s.</p> <p>None of this change was caused by human activity. Climate is an average of 30 years weather. Both are defined as: coupled, non linear, chaotic (in the sense that very small variations to inputs can produce very large output change) systems. This limits reliable weather predictions to 10 days at most and makes long range climate predictions more the business of soothsayers than scientists.</p>

<p>Yours truly, Doug Hurst, 29Dec23</p>
<p>Canberra Times published, 29Dec23 Talking nonsense It's no mean feat to shoot yourself in both feet with both barrels, but Doug Hurst (Letters, December 26) achieved this by claiming the Bureau of Meteorology's failure to predict weird weather in North Queensland demonstrates the impossibility of forecasting future climate. First barrel: as everyone who has not been living under a rock for the last 50 years understands, weather and climate are different things and predicting future climate is actually easier. It has also been demonstrated over several decades that climate predictions from the BOM, amongst all the world's other meteorologists and climate scientists, have been depressingly accurate. Second barrel: the fact that the behaviour of the remnants of tropical cyclone Jasper proved to be almost unprecedented, and therefore almost impossible to predict, precisely demonstrates the frightening truth that climate change is already affecting our weather. Growing difficulties with future weather forecasts will only be one among many problems we will face and far from the worst. Felix MacNeill, Dickson</p>
<p>Canberra Times published, 29Dec23 Another record Following Doug Hurst's blithe questioning of the impacts of climate change on the grounds there are record cold spells in China (Letters December 27), I'd like to announce another record. There must now be an unprecedented number of times on which Doug and sceptics like him have used single weather events to undermine climate science. How long will they refuse to accept that it is the increasing frequency of extreme weather that we need to be acknowledging? Eric Hunter, Cook</p>
<p>Version published Canberra Times, 28Dec23 The Australian GenCost23 Validity? I have just been through, in some detail, the CSIRO report GenCost23 and find it underwhelming. At the very beginning, a CSIRO disclaimer advises that "the information contained in this publication comprises general statements ... The reader is advised and needs to be aware that such information may be incomplete or unable to be used in any specific situation. No reliance or actions must therefore, be made on that information without seeking prior expert professional, scientific and technical advice." If the CSIRO does not guarantee the validity of its report, why should Mr Bowen adopt it as gospel other than for crass political reasons? The report is dated July 2023 but only recently released. Why? Was it first subject to political scrutiny and induced change? The report has several tables purporting to give the relative costs of various electrical energy sources – fossil fuel combinations and renewable combinations, as well as for Small Modular Reactor (SMR) nuclear, but no consideration of full-sized nuclear plants. All options, including the SMR, are assumed to have a 30-year life but with no discussion of what a 30-year life means. It gives Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs in terms of \$/Kw of generated capacity but no idea of what is entailed for each, eg the need to replace and bury turbine blades about every 10 years. Estimates are from a position of investment in new renewable projects. Sunk costs of past projects, ie. past investments are not taken into account. That may be OK for new investments, but 'sunk costs' often represent failures and waste of taxpayers' money. There is no mention of any implied costs of loss of amenity of productive land or forests or the environment in general – Do we need to destroy the environment to save it? There is no mention of government subsidies, hidden or otherwise.</p>

<p>While the report implies consideration of the cost of the extensive transmission grids required, the required transmission network is not addressed as such.</p> <p>As presented, the data defies any expert analysis to establish its validity, albeit many references are cited. Thus, the CSIRO is saying “trust us”. But, why should we, as a government agency beholden to the current Government on a renewables bender?</p> <p>Whatever its remit, while the report talks about renewables and government goals for climate change, there is no mention of the strategic vulnerability that the Government is placing the country in by almost complete reliance for renewables on overseas sources, notably China.</p> <p>M. Flint, Canberra, 26Dec23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 27Dec23]</p> <p>China's Deep Freeze</p> <p>There is no sign of warming in Beijing, where (according to the ABC) nine days below -10 degrees are the coldest December temperatures since records began in 1951. It's probably just weather with no climate implications, but if it was a hot spell the climate lobby would be out in force.</p> <p>Doug Hurst, Chapman</p>
<p>Canberra Times</p> <p>Climate change zealots</p> <p>People like Jennie Goldie (letters, 20Dec23) need to get a good grip on themselves. I might take some notice of her if and when she could ever explain how Australia can make the slightest difference to global warming, let alone to permanent climate change when Australia contributes but 1.1 per cent of world emissions and produces only 7 per cent of world coal (most, if not all being high quality coal need for steelmaking). And to think she could be an acolyte of the emissions zealot Bowen! And don't give me any of the sophisticated claptrap about how Australia should lead the world by banning coal. Australia could disappear off the map tomorrow and most of the world's 8.1 billion inhabitants would not know or care.</p> <p>M. Flint Erindale Centre 20Dec23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 20Dec23]</p> <p>Australia must set the example</p> <p>Janaline Oh, in her defence of Australia continuing to export fossil fuels, really does stretch credibility to breaking point ("Stopping new coal and gas exports won't reduce emissions", Opinion, December 18). She uses the drug-dealer's defence then argues that "Australia must be the dealer who takes their clients to rehab and supports them off their habit". Give us a break. Other countries are not going to have any incentive to move away from fossil fuels if they have an easy supply of them.</p> <p>It's a vacuous argument, devoid of moral merit. Australia has to set an example, even if it costs us in the short term. We have to both stop exports and stop approving any new coal and gas developments.</p> <p>Thus, it is bitterly disappointing, after Climate Change and Energy Minister Chris Bowen performed so well at COP28 in Dubai, that the federal government announced it is planning to subsidise the Main Arm project in Darwin that will open the Beetaloo Basin - potentially unlocking huge new fossil gas exports.</p> <p>Jenny Goldie, Cooma, NSW</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 3Dec23]</p> <p>Tougher climate commitments</p> <p>All the fine words uttered by Climate Change and Energy Minister Chris Bowen will amount to nothing if the Albanese government does not recognise the gross inadequacy of its emissions reduction policy and make more realistic commitments.</p> <p>Climate scientists insist that Australia should be aiming for an emissions reduction target of at least 50 per cent and up to 75 per cent by 2030 if is to reach net zero emissions by 2050. The IPCC's 1.5-degree Paris Agreement limit has already been passed, and the two degree absolute limit is vulnerable.</p> <p>Wealthy countries, including Australia, must make radical cuts to their emissions if the world is to avoid disaster.</p> <p>Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 3Dec23]</p> <p>The population bomb</p>

<p>I am sick to death of demographers and economists, without a shred of environmental awareness, pronouncing on demographic issues. Such was the case with Rocky Scopelliti ("The declining birth rate must be treated similar to climate change", November 29) who wanted to lift the birthrate.</p> <p>Does he not understand that the world is in the midst of a climate crisis? Should the world warm by three degrees as the UN predicted last week in its sobering Emissions Gap report, then much of the world will become uninhabitable, including parts of Australia.</p> <p>The report said "scientists predict the world could pass several catastrophic points of no return, from the runaway melting of ice sheets to the Amazon rainforest drying out".</p> <p>Scientists have already warned the increasing incidence of extreme weather events will make it difficult for food production to keep up with growing populations. That means famine. It means millions of people on the move in search of land to grow food.</p> <p>Issues like maintaining the workforce pale into insignificance alongside probable future scenarios.</p> <p>Jenny Goldie, Cooma, NSW</p>
<p>Canberra Times</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>It is so sad to see people like Peter Campbell (Letters, 2Dec23) so ready to attack letter writers about climate change, without first reading the letter in detail. In my case (Letters, 28Nov23), I concluded, among other things, that "Australia, as a good world citizen, needs to do its bit but not shoot itself in both feet economically, as it is at present."</p> <p>I invite Mr Campbell to explain how Australia can make any difference to global warming, let alone climate change, but know expecting a rational response would be a vain hope, as no other critic like him has ever responded to my challenge – because they simply cannot.</p> <p>M. Flint Canberra, 2Dec23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 2Dec23]</p> <p>Climate sophistry</p> <p>It's good to see conservative letter writers start to move on from decades of outright denial of climate science. But it is frustrating that they continue to argue that Australia should not do very much (M Flint, Letters, November 11). The argument that we hardly need to do anything since we don't contribute much to global emissions is both morally bankrupt and self-defeating.</p> <p>Countries that individually contribute 2 per cent of global emissions taken together contribute about a third of global emissions. It is crucial our third is reduced, just as it is crucial the other two thirds are reduced.</p> <p>If we do not demonstrate strong action every other country will be able to point to Australia and claim their own exceptionalism. "Why should we reduce our small percentage when Australia won't?"</p> <p>Our failure to take the necessary steps to mitigate emissions would be used to justify the inaction of others.</p> <p>Peter Campbell, Cook</p>
<p>Canberra Times</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>Sad to see Matt Gately (Letters, 1Dec23) show his obvious bias in implying I am a climate denier for "having the gall" to criticise climate change warriors. If he had bothered to read my letter, it says that critics agree that there is gradual global warming but that the Government is on the wrong, very expensive track in trying to prevent global warming, when Australia can have zero effect on it, whatever it does, and that Australia should be working instead on proofing itself against global warming. I invite Mr Gately to explain how Australia can make any difference to global warming, let alone climate change, but know expecting a rational response would be a vain hope, as no other critic like Mr Gately has ever responded to my challenge – because they simply cannot.</p> <p>M. Flint Canberra 1Dec23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 1Dec23]</p> <p>Stop the Denial (CTimes, 1Dec23)</p> <p>It's now clear so-called panic merchants like Dr Amy Hiller and many, many others are right about greenhouse gas emissions' catastrophic effect on the climate. So from where do the many, many climate change deniers, including M Flint (Letters, November 28) summon the gall to keep plugging their disgraced, debunked opinions?</p> <p>Matt Gately, Rivett</p>
<p>The Australian</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>When will climate change warriors like Dr Amy Hiller (Letters 29Nov23) and others like her ever start to recognise some basic facts about Australia's misguided push to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I am still waiting for proponents like her to explain how Australia can make any difference to global warming, let alone climate change, when Australia contributes but 1.1 per cent of world</p>

<p>emissions and produces only 7 per cent of world coal said to be causing most emissions. These agitators need to answer this question and why an estimated spend of \$1.5 trillion on emissions reduction for zero effect on global warming is a good idea. Given that global warming is occurring (even critics of the panic merchants agree that warming is slowly occurring), Australia's climate policies should be on drought, flood and food protection for the country, not on excessive, ideological emissions policies for zero effect. That said, Australia, as a good world citizen, needs to do its bit but not shoot itself in both feet economically, as it is at present.</p> <p>M. Flint Canberra, 29Nov23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 28Nov23]</p> <p>We are among worst offenders</p> <p>Australians are among the top 1 per cent of the world's greenhouse emitters. That 1 per cent of the world's population causes more than three times their share of greenhouse emissions. In 2019 the average Australian caused 24 tonnes of greenhouse emissions. That was almost four times the world average of 6.4 tonnes. Only the Solomon Islands, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, Turkmenistan and the United Arab Emirates caused more emissions per capita than Australia. If climate changes proceed as expected, one in six species could face extinction. Australians are putting one and a half million species at risk of extinction - including 100,000 Australian species and 1000 species in the ACT - while we each continue to add more than six tonnes of greenhouse emissions to the atmosphere each year. Leon Arundell, Downer</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 28Nov23]</p> <p>Time is perilously short</p> <p>The recent letters and editorial on our climate change predicament all miss a fundamental truth. Our way of life is dependent on fossil fuels. The dramatic growth of the global human enterprise and population since the industrial revolution has been enabled by fossil fuels and particularly oil. Everything we do involves energy or a product of energy use. The result is we have overshot the natural carrying capacity of the planet as is evident in the global degradation of the environment, the loss of biodiversity, depletion of natural resources and of course climate change. Nature created fossil fuels for free. They are phenomenally dense carriers of chemical energy and all we have to do is dig them up and use them when and how we wish, but even these are showing signs of depletion. We now have to try and create our energy sources from nature's diffuse energy flows such as sunlight, wind, radioactivity or by creating storages for water to generate hydroelectricity. If we choose not to do it Mother Nature will do it for us chaotically through climate change impacts and other feedbacks. Time is perilously short. I hope for the best, but fear the worst. Trevor Powell, Bruce</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 27Nov23]</p> <p>Act now on climate</p> <p>Australia needs to walk the climate change walk ("Climate change is an existential threat," November 22). If the world continues to cause 6.4 tonnes of annual per capita greenhouse emissions, then the average person will cause another 45 tonnes of emissions by 2030, 109 tonnes by 2040, and 167 tonnes by 2050. The Australian government estimates that, in reaching our 2030 emissions target, the average Australian will cause another 100 tonnes of emissions by 2030. In reaching our 2050 target, the average Australian will cause about 180 tonnes by 2040, and about 200 tonnes by 2050. If the world matches Australia's per capita emissions, we will exceed two degrees of global warming before 2040. Leon Arundell, Downer</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 27Nov23]</p> <p>Australia's hellish future</p> <p>According to well-known American climate scientist Professor Michael Mann in his latest book Our Fragile Moment Australia would be the worst place to live under a global warming scenario. This is based on his explanation of the planet's history and the location of this continent in a strong, drying hot zone with much of the land mass remote from maritime moisture. Given this is an expert view that Australia is at particular risk from global heating it behooves the Australian government to maximise domestic and international action on climate change. However, I have never heard the government make this point. Roderick Holesgrove, Crace</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 28Nov23]</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>When will climate change warriors like Dr Amy Hiller (Letters 24Nov23) and others like her ever start to recognise some basic facts about Australia's misguided push to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I am still waiting for proponents like her to explain how Australia can make any difference to global warming, let alone climate change, when Australia contributes but 1.1 per cent of world emissions and produces only 7 per cent of world coal said to be causing most emissions. These agitators need to answer this</p>

<p>question and why an estimated spend of \$1.5 trillion on emissions reduction for zero effect on global warming is a good idea. Given that global warming is occurring (even critics of the panic merchants agree that warming is slowly occurring), Australia's climate policies should be on drought and flood protection for the country, not on excessive, ideological emissions policies for zero effect. That said, Australia, as a good world citizen, needs to do its bit but not shoot itself in both feet economically, as it is at present. M. Flint Canberra, 26Nov23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 26Nov23] Population reduction holds the real key to carbon emissions control I keep worrying that Australia is too focused on reducing our 1.3 per cent contribution to world carbon emissions. Sure, this is a complementary component of a global problem, but in itself it will not protect the Barrier Reef or prevent our intensive bushfire/flooding events. The government's recent announcement that Australia is rejoining the Green Climate Fund that contributes to the undeveloped countries is good. However the "modest amount" of \$200 million over four years is far too little. My major concern is to address birth control, because of the future energy needs of a booming world population. Existing birth control practices have reduced world population growth, but action to reduce this by another 1 billion by 2050 is urgently required and affordable. Australia's population growth is out of control, a reader says. Picture Shutterstock Australia's population growth is out of control, a reader says. Picture Shutterstock We should direct some significant climate change endeavours in this direction. Geoff Henkel, Farrer</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 26Nov23] More needs to be done Given that Australia is not on track to meet our climate targets, big investment that will expand renewable energy and storage by 32 gigawatts before 2030 is just the ticket. Well done, Chris Bowen. Like a weight loss program, however, Labor's scheme needs to ensure that while pumping iron and beefing up renewables, it doesn't keep consuming Big Macs (gas) with coke (coal) on the side. Excess weight won't vanish with an unhealthy diet. Similarly, emissions won't drop while we keep indulging in the fossil fuel buffet. For the huge benefits of emissions reductions to be realised, we need to be all in on the healthy, clean, green pathway. Dr Amy Hiller, Kew, Vic</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 25Nov23] Depressing forecast Watch: Peter Gibson from Platypus House in Tasmania talks about the impact of climate change on platypuses. Thank you for your excellent, albeit depressing, editorial ("Climate change is an existential threat", November 22) in response to the UN's Emissions Gap report. As the latter notes, at three degrees of warming, "...scientists predict the world could pass several catastrophic points of no return, from the runaway melting of ice sheets to the Amazon rainforest drying out". In his 2007 book Six Degrees, Mark Lynas focuses on what each degree of warming will mean. The recurring theme of the Three Degrees chapter is the difficulty in conducting agriculture. Feeding people will be made ever more difficult by drought in many countries, more monsoonal precipitation extremes in others, and strengthening cyclonic storms. As Lynas wrote: "With structural famine gripping much of the subtropics, hundreds of millions of people will have only one choice left other than death for themselves and their families: They will have to pack up their belongings and leave ... As social collapse accelerates, new political philosophies may emerge ... that seek to lay blame where it truly belongs - on the rich countries that lit the fire that has now begun to consume the world". Australia is one such country. If nothing else, we must get out of coal by the end of the decade. Jenny Goldie, Cooma, NSW Editor's Note: Ms Goldie is still deluded</p>
<p>Canberra Times [Published 25Nov23] Emissions are rising Kudos to The Canberra Times editorial team for tackling the climate change sized elephant in the room ("Climate change is an existential threat", November 22). The 2023 UN Emissions Gap Report outlines that we are on track to warm by almost three degrees by 2100. This will unleash social, health, ecological and economic disasters. Yet, despite reductions pledges, emissions still rose last year. Climate Change Minister Chris Bowen may have found an appropriate path forward, but still he, and all his global counterparts, are treading far too slowly and timidly. Polling consistently shows that the majority of Australians support decisive climate action. We must push past the fossil fuel juggernaut and step up all aspects of decarbonisation. Dr Amy Hiller, Kew, Vic Editor's Note: Dr Hiller is still deluded</p>

<p>Canberra Times Increased emissions are fuelling a climate change catastrophe</p> <p>The news is very bad. Your editorial "Climate change is an existential threat" (November 22) clearly explains the impending climate crisis.</p> <p>The current UN's report is that on the present trajectory the climate will become irreversibly threatening to all living things by the century's end.</p> <p>Promises to reduce emissions are easily made, yet the UN report reveals that global emissions are actually increasing: greenhouse gases actually rose by 1.2 per cent from 2021 to 2022.</p> <p>What is going on? That we are busy making carbon dioxide intensive wars may be one factor.</p> <p>Another article also gives us a clue. Leaders may be unable to understand what is happening. The report ("Ex-UK PM 'bamboozled' by COVID science") reveals Boris Johnson, whose decisions caused so many COVID-related deaths in Britain, struggled to understand the simple graphs the scientists were showing him.</p> <p>We have a leadership problem.</p> <p>Climate change has already led to longer, and more intense, bushfire seasons in much of Australia. Picture by Graham Tidy Harry Davis, Campbell</p>	<p>[Published 23Nov23]</p>
<p>Canberra Times Climate action essential</p> <p>Congratulations on your editorial "Climate change is an existential threat" (November 22), and particularly for your conclusion "the real issue is the cost of doing nothing. That is a bill the world cannot afford to pay".</p> <p>The recent United Nations' Emissions Gap report concludes that on present trends, the world will warm by up to 2.9 degrees this century unless advanced economies transition away from fossil fuels.</p> <p>Failure to do this could, as you note, result in "runaway melting of the polar icecaps and the complete loss of the Amazon rainforest".</p> <p>The former will cause dramatic rises in sea level, inundation of heavily populated, food-producing land. The latter would transform the world's largest natural carbon capture and storage system and a major source of life-giving oxygen into a huge source of carbon dioxide, the main driver of destructive global heating.</p> <p>Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>	<p>[Published 23Nov23]</p>
<p>Canberra Times The gates of hell</p> <p>According to the pre-COP28 UN Environment Program report and United Nations Secretary-General Antonio Guterres the world is headed to a "hellish future" of plus three degrees global warming this century.</p> <p>Implementing future policies (a big if) would shave just 0.1 degrees off this projection. There is no exaggeration here. Just think of the weather and impacts being experienced now when plus 1.5 degrees has not been permanently breached.</p> <p>What will the climate be like in the next century when children born today will still be alive? But where is the government action and public and media outcry. Have we we lost all perspective?</p> <p>Roderick Holesgrove, Crace</p>	<p>[Published 23Nov23]</p>
<p>The Australian Climate change</p> <p>When will climate change warriors like Fiona Colin, Anne O'Hara and others like them (Letters 10Nov23) ever start to recognise some basic facts about Australia's misguided, ideological push to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Do they not know that Australia contributes but 1.1 per cent of world emissions and that, while exporting a great deal of highest quality coal essential to steelmaking and our standard of living, produces only 7 per cent of world coal production that is producing much of the emissions. These facts alone mean that the outrageous costs being incurred by renewable energy policies in Australia will not and cannot ever affect global warming, let alone permanent climate change. Then the world's population is yet to go from 8.1 billion (of which Australia accounts for just 0.31 per cent) to some 10.5 billion, most of which will be from developing countries, already being over 30 per cent of world population, trying to catch economically. They will burn fossil fuels to do it. Australia's climate ideologues are deluded and need to think a bit more clearly.</p> <p>M. Flint Canberra 10Nov23</p>	
<p>Canberra City News Climate change</p> <p>So many words about climate change in the media but so little about the fundamental cause, ie world population growth and the energy demands thereof which produce the greenhouse gases that are said to be causing the problem. World population is yet to grow from the current 8.1 billion by 30 per cent to over 10.5 billion before the end of the century, most of this increase being due to developing countries of the Indian sub-continent, Africa and South-East Asia. Countries of these regions – India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Nigeria together (2.343billion) account for about 29 per cent of population. However, all of these nations understandably aspire to greater standards of living, all of which demands energy, most of which will come from fossil fuels for the rest of this century and probably beyond. When one considers these demands, one can easily reach the conclusion that, without some natural or induced catastrophe blighting the world, the demand for energy will continue to increase and the vast expense by the world in renewable energy sources (themselves renewable every 20-30 years) in the hope of reducing non-vapour greenhouse gas</p>	<p>[Published 23Nov23]</p>

<p>emissions is really a forlorn hope. Australia alone is planning to waste an estimated \$1.5 trillion on renewable energy infrastructure which, with only 1.1 per cent of world emissions, will have zero effect on global warming, let alone permanent climate change. Some investment!</p> <p>M. Flint Erindale Centre 30Oct23</p>
<p>City News [published 26Jul23] No policies for toxic carbon fibre blades VI Evans (Letters, CN July 6) has been misinterpreted by renewables supporter Ben Brackhurst in Letters on July 13. Turbines are not manufactured in Australia due their toxic nature, allowing us to pretend we are saving our planet. The carbon fibre blades are the main source, both in production and difficulties of disposal, for which we have no policy. The energy footprint is enormous, which requires more than half its life before useful electrons are generated, even before the environmental cost of access roads and transmission lines to remote sites are considered. A recent audit found, already, 600 Australian turbines are approaching the end of their useful life. The very comprehensive, now released Batterham Report on renewables, has their cost to 2050 at a colossal \$9000 billion together with a trashed landscape. Canada will have a Small Nuclear Reactor, BWX300 in service this decade, more in 2032 and 2036. We have our own uranium supply! Urgent action is needed not talk. Australia will also be forced to follow for AUKUS commitment compliance. Tough choices but imperative. Ken Murtagh, Hughes</p>
<p>The Australian Cities and Climate While the article by Julian Cribb (First megacity failure is coming, Canberra Times 16Jul23) is primarily about the existential threat to mega and large cities from growth, the messages are clear – it is not just the big cities at risk but all cities and even large towns; and that population growth on this planet of limited resources is the source of the problem. While there has been unending noise about climate change, there has been relatively little talk about the population increase that is said to be causing it. The current world population of eight billion already has the planet under stress. We are already seeing mass, illegal migration of peoples out of Africa, the middle East and Central America, some caused by drought but mostly by the failure of home-country governments and economic envy. As world population increases to 12 billion, as forecast, disaster forebodes. The effort and trillions going into reducing CO2 emissions without addressing the population problem is like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. Some writers on climate change have concluded that unrelenting population growth will ultimately prove to be the existential threat to the human race rather than global warming and climate change (if not nuclear war beforehand). One only has to read about the rise of Hitler in the 1930s to see how an intelligent and clever race can be led like lemmings to their destruction. Is the same thing happening now around much of a world led by climate change evangelists? M. Flint Erindale 16Jul23</p>
<p>The Editor Naivety towards the Voice How naive is Eric hunter of Cook (People change their position, Letters, 23Jul23), in commending Thomas Mayo for changing his mind about the Voice he wants, among other things, one leading to reparations to indigenous people. Mayo has simply been told to keep his trap shut because he is damaging the Yes campaign – but the damage is done. Mayo has done a great job for the No campaign, M. Flint Erindale Centre 23Jul23</p>
<p>City News [published 6Apr23] Renewables are not cheap to start with Douglas Mackenzie (Letters, CN March 23) claims that nuclear energy is too expensive and that energy experts and scientists are virtually unanimous that renewables are cheaper. I think he will find there are just as many energy experts and scientists that disagree and state that, in the long run, nuclear power is far cheaper. The so-called renewables are not cheap to start with and they have to be replaced every 10-15 years, yet modular nuclear power stations last for 60 years. The renewables are not being recycled so they have to be buried. This is not only an added cost, but they will contaminate the ground where they are buried as well as the surrounding water tables. As to the time to build the nuclear reactors, how long is it going to take to build enough solar power and wind turbines to give us 100 per cent reliable electricity? Dr Mackenzie's last comment: "Thanks to almost a decade of government inaction, we cannot afford to wait that long". I think he will find it is a lot longer than a decade (from all sides of politics) that we have been having problems.</p>

<p>Vi Evans via email</p> <p>City News [published 6Apr23]</p> <p>In climate, common sense is overrated</p> <p>Carol Dunnet felt Max Flint's thoughts on climate change (Letters, CN March 23) showed "common sense logic". But common sense is overrated.</p> <p>Stuart Chase, the American economist said: "Common sense is what tells us the earth is flat." For Albert Einstein, common sense was "the collection of prejudices acquired by age 18".</p> <p>When it comes to climate change, the science of thousands must overrule the common sense of one.</p> <p>For example, Mr Flint claimed global warming was slow. Yet science reveals that the planet is warming faster than it has in 10,000 years. It seems slow to us, but Australia is already halfway to 3 degrees of warming which, according to the Australian Academy of Science, would mean many of Australia's ecological systems would be unrecognisable, the decline of our natural resources would accelerate and we would lose thousands of species.</p> <p>This fast warming is caused mainly by land clearing, agriculture, transport and the burning of fossil fuels releasing greenhouse gases (more science). Anyone who views the NASA graph at climate.nasa.gov/evidence/ showing how CO2 levels have not been this high for 800,000 years and are rising fast will be shocked.</p> <p>Common sense would not have predicted that.</p> <p>Ray Peck, Hawthorn, Victoria</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 27Mar23]</p> <p>The clock is ticking</p> <p>In the report "Early days' for ACT climate adaption" (canberratimes.com.au, March 22) ANU Professor Mark Howden, a co-author of the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Synthesis Report is quoted as saying "It's still early days in terms of the ACT and climate change adaption, so I think we've got a lot of room to move on that".</p> <p>Would that it were so. CSIRO scientists found Australia has already warmed by 1.47 (give or take 0.24) degrees since 1910, when national records began.</p> <p>In other words, Australia has already broken the IPCC 1.5 degrees limit set by the IPCC in the 2015 Paris Accords, which refers to average global temperature rise since pre-industrial times, i.e. before about 1850. We have run out of time; and must act decisively and immediately.</p> <p>Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>
<p>City News</p> <p>Climate change guru at it again</p> <p>The self-proclaimed climate change guru, Dr Douglas Mackenzie loves to get stuck into me about my letters on climate change (letters, 23Mar23). But Carol Dunnet of Wanniasa (Letters 23Mar23), as well as others think I am on the right logical track.</p> <p>I repeat that if Australia disappeared off the map tomorrow, it would not make one iota of difference to global warming let alone climate change. I am still waiting (having challenged him before) for Dr Mackenzie to rebut this contention. In a scientific way, presuming he is a scientist of sorts.</p> <p>M. Flint Erindale Centre 23Mar23</p>
<p>City News[published 23Mar23]</p> <p>Refreshing' letters to the editor</p> <p>So refreshing to read in "Letters", CN March 9 by Vi Evans re: the Voice and Max Flint re: climate change, their common sense logic. We need more of this, there is so little of it these days. Keep up the good work, Vi and Max.</p> <p>Carol Dunnet, Wanniasa 23Mar23</p>
<p>City News[published 23Mar23]</p> <p>Max is obviously not a scientist</p> <p>Max Flint (Letters, CN March 9) is obviously not a scientist. He claims that if Australia miraculously ceased to exist, it would "not make one iota of difference to global warming let alone climate change.</p> <p>He seems not to understand that there can't be one without the other.</p> <p>He then concedes "given that slow warming is occurring, whatever the drivers may be, Australia's priority is to protect its citizens from the possible consequences, not to pursue needless emissions-reduction policies that risk destroying our economy for absolutely zero effect".</p> <p>The CSIRO has shown that Australia has warmed by 1.47 degrees C since records began in 1910. That is certainly not "slow" warming: the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in its Paris Agreement set a medium-term target of 1.50 degrees above pre-industrial levels and carbon neutrality by 2050. Australia has, for all intents and purposes, already broken through the first barrier.</p> <p>Mr Flint concludes that we must "look to nuclear energy ... before the unsustainable renewables policy sends us broke while disfiguring the countryside."</p> <p>Energy experts and scientists are virtually unanimous in concluding that "renewables" with the latest battery technology are by far the least expensive, and now most reliable, form of energy production.</p>

<p>Solar farms cover relatively small areas and leave ample green (or grazing) space between panels; and wind turbines are so widely spaced that there is almost no loss of productivity from the land upon which they are built. Finally, standard nuclear power stations cost about \$10-12 billion and take about 10-12 years to build. Thanks to almost a decade of government inaction, we cannot afford to wait that long. Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 11Mar23] Humanity poisoning itself As Bob Douglas (Letters, March 6) wrote, there is solid scientific evidence that human civilisation is facing collapse, if not total destruction. Such a catastrophe will be caused by a combination of overpopulation and runaway global heating. There are strong signs that the former is already a reality and the second is imminent unless the governments of developed nations and advanced developing nations (such as China and India) take immediate and decisive action to rein in emissions from fossil fuels. It is puzzling, disappointing and frightening that, rather than reducing emissions from fossil fuels, numerous countries are now increasing them. The Russia-Ukraine war is only partly to blame: the fossil fuel industry is the real behind-the-scenes culprit. Dr Douglas Mackenzie, Deakin</p>
<p>City News [published 9Mar23] Australian [published 20Feb23] The Editor The Canberra Times (also to City News; The Australian) Climate Change Science This letter is to all of those readers who believe that the science is "in" on climate change. I have news for you – the same science says that Australia could disappear off the map tomorrow and it would not make an iota of difference to global warming let alone to climate change. Given that slow global warming is occurring, whatever the drivers may be, Australia's priority is to protect its citizens from the possible consequences, not to pursue needless emissions reduction policies that risk destroying our economy for absolutely zero effect. We need to control bushfire fuel loads, stop people living among the gumtrees and save every drop of water that falls on the country, while pursuing water conservation in homes, agriculture and industry. Then we need to look to nuclear energy for electricity production before the unsustainable renewables policy sends us broke while disfiguring the countryside. M. Flint Canberra 18Feb23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 17Feb23] Denial doesn't work Garry Linnell's suggestion that denial is how some "cope with the prospect of annihilation" was insightful ("Give Science a chance to outrun ignorance", February 11). Denial is not a positive coping mechanism though. On issues like human-induced climate change, for example, we may want to bury our heads in the sand, but, if we are to achieve the best possible future for our children, we must absorb the scientific facts and engage with climate solutions. The concept of active hope is helpful for achieving acceptance and maintaining optimism. Hope springs from positive action. Dr Amy Hiller, Kew</p>
<p>The Australian [published 17Feb23] Energy message Amy Hiller (Letters, 16/2) seems to have misread the International Energy Agency message that to reach net zero by 2050 there cannot be any more investments in fossil fuels. The message was that with world energy demand doubling by then, much of Asia still intending to burn coal for decades to come and fossil fuels still part of the intended mix in the US and Europe, net zero cannot and will not happen. But as your editorial points out, there is much fantasising afoot on this matter and Hiller is not alone; the Greens and Energy Minister Chris Bowen are even further from reality. Doug Hurst, Chapman, ACT</p>
<p>The Canberra Times Climate Change When died-in-the-wool Greens like Felix MacNeill (Letters, 17Feb23) rail against exploitation of fossil fuels, they have their heads firmly buried in the sand. The looney Greens and Labor camp-followers, bent on destroying Australia's source of wealth and living standards, must be forced to defend their irrational position on emissions when Australia could disappear off the planet tomorrow and it would not make a scrap of difference to global warming let alone to climate change. Given that slow global warming is occurring, whatever the drivers may be, our priority is to protect ourselves from the possible consequences, not to destroy our economy for zero effect. M. Flint, Canberra, 17Feb23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 17Feb23] The Greens were right to block Rudd's flawed climate bill I see the usual hacks are trying to discredit the Greens by dragging out the tired canard of "making the perfect the enemy of the good"; merely demonstrating that cliché is the enemy of reality.</p>

<p>Rudd's initial non-negotiable CPRS proposal was simply bad; little better than a con - and needed to be opposed. When Gillard was, subsequently, required and prepared to negotiate with the Greens and rural independents, the result was a reasonably effective and affordable policy: far from perfect, but demonstrably good. Sadly, that policy was destroyed by the radical fantasist Tony Abbott and Labor was unwilling or unable to defend it effectively. And now, when even that child of the fossil fuel industry, the International Energy Agency, points out that we cannot afford any new coal or gas mines if we are to avoid catastrophic climate change, it becomes clear where the truly extreme and unrealistic position lies.</p> <p>And even Labor's weak 43 percent target will become unachievable if any new coal or gas projects are approved. Yes, we will still need some coal and gas while we complete the transition of our energy system, but the existing mines are more than sufficient to provide that.</p> <p>You cannot appease the laws of physics. It's already too late to prevent dangerous and expensive impacts from climate change but, with bold, brave action, we can still prevent catastrophe. The only sane resolution to the so-called "climate wars" is to win.</p> <p>Felix MacNeill, Dickson</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 8Feb23]</p> <p>Labor's deceptions</p> <p>So, the modus operandi of the Albanese government has finally been revealed. Prior to the election, give no details of "the plan" and then implement policies/changes which were never mentioned ie: "value-based capitalism" aka socialism, preference for investments; enterprise bargaining and so on.</p> <p>After the election, introduce the Voice, but give no details. Then, with vague references to a document that may or may not be the blueprint, no-one can provide the actual information about what will be implemented.</p> <p>Very few people would go to a restaurant and just accept what the chef offered without considering the menu, cost or ingredients. We're empathetic and compassionate, but we're not stupid. Give us the exact details. If not then what are they hiding?</p> <p>Sharon Bishop, Palmerston</p>
<p>The Editor Canberra Times</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>When, oh when are people like Roderick Holesgrove (letters, 7Jan23) ever going to recognise that Australia, with 1.7% of the world's population and about 1.3% of world's CO2 emissions, could drop off the map at any time and not have the slightest impact on the climate, let alone changes to global temperatures. Given that slow global warming is occurring, whatever the drivers, our priority is to protect ourselves from the possible consequences, not try to big-note ourselves on the world stage to zero effect.</p> <p>M. Flint Erindale Centre 7Jan23</p>
<p>Canberra Times [published 7Jan23]</p> <p>Rising temperatures</p> <p>I await to see Australian media reports on record winter temperatures in Europe. On New Year's Day it was 19 degrees in Korbellow, Poland and 24.9 degrees in Bilbao. These temperatures are degrees above normal. And resort owners are making snow in ski fields in Switzerland.</p> <p>Meanwhile, United Kingdom Met Office data indicates that 2022 was the UK's warmest year on record and the Australian Bureau of Meteorology suggests that we will be back in El Nino by the end of 2023.</p> <p>We are fast approaching an average global temperature rise of 1.5 degrees, which will increase the probability of breaching global tipping points.</p> <p>So let's see much stronger global and Australian action in 2023 and years ahead - our grandkids depend on it!</p> <p>Roderick Holesgrove, Crace</p>
<p>City News [published 15Dec22]</p> <p>Fossil fuel-based products are in the past</p> <p>Vi Evans (Letters, CN November 17) declares she's aware of the difference between the past and the future, and says that my comment on her earlier praise of fossil fuels and the plastics made from them failed to suggest what might be used in place of those plastics.</p> <p>No, I didn't waste space providing lots of examples, as a simple Google or similar search discloses so many recent developments in bioplastics, etcetera, and several products currently being marketed in this area.</p> <p>As the development and production of environmentally-friendly alternatives continues to mature, if we effectively recycled the fossil fuel-based plastics we have already produced, rather than discarding them into landfill and our oceans, there would be no need to continue producing new ones.</p> <p>The time for fossil fuel-based products is indeed in the past and the sooner we stop producing them the better. Yes, their replacements need further development and those already on the market may currently cost more than their fossil fuel-based alternatives, but those are elements of the price we have to pay now to reduce the massive damage we have caused to our environment, ourselves and other living things as soon as possible.</p> <p>John M Schmidt, Monash</p>