

## Trick for sane to survive the climate insanity

Terry Mccrann, The Australian, 12:00AM December 10, 2016

I thought we — that is to say, those people who remained relatively both rational and sane and wanted to continue living in the 21st century — knew the game that was and arguably had to be played. We live in a time of mass hysteria. It is every bit as — literally — apocalyptic as the various cults and their messianic preachers which rose and fell at various times across Europe from the Dark Ages through to the conflict and confusion of the post-Protestant Reformation.

Then 1530s Munster had its Jan Bockelson, we have Tim — the rain won't fall, the rivers won't fill, the earth will burn and we'll all frizzle — Flannery and ten thousands of others.

All of them preaching the time-honoured exhortation: confess thy sins; renounce thy gross behaviours; adorn thyself in sackcloth — can't hurt to add a little flagellation; and follow me into a carbon-free — appropriately, 'nasty, brutish and short' — future.

Then and now, these preachers all seemed to live the high life on the sackcloth backs of their followers, rendering to themselves exactly what they demanded their followers deny their selves. In the modern case, CO2 emissions. But that's an extension of the story.

Now as then the trick for the sane was to survive the insanity: by chanting the required religious slogans, by paying slavering obeisance to the mad preachers; by joining in the castigating of those who would not repent of, indeed denied, their sinful behaviours. Can't hurt to embrace a little hypocrisy.

The objective was simple: to wait out the time to the hysteria's inevitable implosion from its own monumental stupidities and contradictions and failure. Basic reality would eventually reassert itself as the mass hypnosis or psychosis burnt itself out.

So to 'the game:' the 'climate change' policy game, started by John Howard in government and taken to the next stage by Tony Abbott in opposition and then back in government. Put simply, it was to wait out the frenzy of committing to excessive, utterly pointless yet punishingly punitive cuts to CO2 emissions, most particularly by locking in a carbon tax or ETS (Emissions Trading Scheme), which would do real and probably irreparable harm. We started with Howard's 'never-never' renewable energy targets — back in 2007, 2020 looked to be 'on the other side' of the climate awakening.

We moved through Abbott's Direct Action — I guess only his then climate spokesman and subsequent minister Greg Hunt ever actually, really, truly, believed in them. And we finished, so to speak, with Abbott's 2030 26-28 per cent emission cuts, actually 'delivered' — at least in the promise on the road to Marrakesh — by his successor, Malcolm Turnbull.

But come on, in each case, surely no sane or half-rational person sensibly believed we would ever actually have even got to those promised destinations, far less contemplate moving to the next stage of lunacy, as assorted loons like Jay, the exquisitely named, Weather-ill,

Daniel Andrews and Anastacia Palaszczuk, have purported to condemn their fervent followers and sullen unbelievers alike to?

Surely by now, the mass psychosis would have faded? As the temperature did not rise as the 'science is settled' models had predicted? The Arctic didn't melt? The islands didn't disappear as the seas rose to swamp them — sure, they hadn't started to fall either, as the 'Messiah-in-chief' prepared to vacate His throne? And even our 'permanent' Down Under drought got, well, rained out?

Surely by now, all the lies of the Global Warming true believers, like those of any apocalyptic cult, would have been exposed so often and so finally as to invite universal ridicule and rejection?

From the biggest lie of all, that the compound most critical for life on earth — CO<sub>2</sub> — was a 'pollutant'; to the 'fake news' that both predated and out-faked all other — the '97 per cent of scientists believe....?' To name just two, as the 'Book of Global Warming Lies' would challenge the Holy Bible in length?

Surely by now, most critically in the policy space, it would be overwhelmingly and undeniably apparent that there quite simply would not be a binding global agreement to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions? That India and even more so China would keep on pumping?

From Copenhagen which turned into Copenfloppen in 2009 despite the energetic leadership of our PM Kevin Rudd to the so-very French Paris non-agreement of 2015? That whatever the science, any CO<sub>2</sub> cuts we made, even going all the way to 100 per cent, would be like pissing in the wind? Or on the Barrier Reef?

That even at Climate Lunacy Ground Zero, Europe, the limits of renewable energy would have become so obvious and undeniable? That if you actually tried to go much beyond 20 per cent of your power generation, you would trigger a return to the earthly reality of an earlier century and not the promised land of Gaian fantasy? Nothing terminates an apocalyptic cult more decisively than arriving at the reality of its consequences.

The somewhat different games that Europe's been playing to 'reduce' its emissions — from massaging the start date to get a running start from closing down Eastern Europe's truly polluting heavy industry, to fiddling permits and offsets — had essentially run their course.

In our case 'Direct Action' has reached its limit. Of course, in the insanity of this mass psychosis, the only rational way to (attempt to) do the irrational — further and significantly cut emissions — is a 'price on carbon.' An ETS or tax. That's the most 'efficient' way of making wind and solar 'cheaper' than coal.

But we weren't supposed to get to this point. Yet the Climate Kool-Air guzzling true believers and the Climate money-guzzling main-chancers have managed to keep the psychosis alive.

It is also why the only course forward to sanity and reality is for the government to abandon the 26-28 per cent and renounce Paris. Let's hope president Trump leads the way.