

Net Zero and the Carbon Capture Pipeline: Renaming Things to Condemn Them



By Kathleen Marquardt

April 4, 2023

According to the UN, *"Net zero is broadly the same as carbon neutral: Emissions are still being generated, but they're offset by the same amount elsewhere. The "net total" of your emissions is then zero."*[\[1\]](#) ^[1]

A pipeline is being set up to transport carbon dioxide (CO₂) captured from ethanol, fertilizer, and other agricultural industrial plants to North Dakota and Illinois where it will be sequestered permanently. Three companies partnering with Wolf Carbon Solutions – Summit Carbon Solutions, Archer Daniel Midlands, and Navigator CO₂ Ventures – plan to use pressure to liquify the CO₂ so it can be transported *via* the pipeline, and then injected deep underground where it will be permanently sequestered.

Interesting. They are planning to bury something they consider highly dangerous to Mother Earth, underground, and hope (pray?) that it stays there. Let's think about that. This whole scheme (and many more equally very possibly deleterious to the earth and its inhabitants – humans, wildlife, and plants) is designed to unhook us from oil and petroleum. Why? Shortly after oil was discovered to be the great replacement of whale oil for lighting and lubrication of machinery, those in power saw the value of this natural resource and wanted

full control of it – or as much as they could get.

But they soon realized that it benefited every stratum of society, down to the poorest. That wasn't in their plans.

Now we are to be unhooked from so-called fossil fuel – petroleum. Why? Because, we are told, it produces much of the carbon emissions that are causing Climate Change, nee Manmade Global Warming. So, the power elite have declared petroleum (the most readily available energy source that is reliable, doesn't cause black lung disease, and isn't "laced with radioactive thorium and uranium, which result in especially detrimental health effects to the people mining it (often children), as well as the air, water, and soil around it",[\[2\]](#)

[\[2\]](#) is fairly easy to access, is found all over (actually under) the earth, and is renewable. So, it must be banned! In true Newspeak, the powers vilify it and claim it must be canceled as soon as possible.

Instead of ever asking the necessary questions here, we are to accept the International Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) initial document that had to be rewritten in Newspeak after it was pulled together because initially, it was no dire warning. It had to be injected with direness on steroids to make it fulfill the Club of Rome warning: *The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself.* – There was no unusual global warming – manmade or otherwise, thus also, the name change.

Next question: where is the proof that CO₂ damages our environment? It isn't there. CO₂ is an integral part of our atmosphere. The Climate Accord is based on information that has been tweaked out of any scientific certainty.

Another necessary question here: why is petroleum called a fossil fuel? From what I read some time ago, Rockefeller, after having made a great deal of money shipping the crude oil on his rail system, bought out many oil drilling companies. Then, to keep his share a large one, he claimed it was from the underground fossils and, being there were just so many fossils and wouldn't be new ones of any number, there was a limited amount of petroleum. Thus, the number of producers must be limited.

But is it a fossil fuel? According to L. Fletcher Prouty, *"oil is a renewable and abiotic fuel"* (not from fossils). *"The Origins of Oil and Petroleum"*,

"Oil is often called a 'fossil' fuel; the idea being that it comes from formerly living organisms. This may have been plausible back when oil wells were drilled into the fossil layers of the earth's crust; but today, great quantities of oil are found in deeper wells that are found below the level of any fossils. How could then oil have come from fossils, or decomposed former living matter, if it exists in rock formations far below layers of fossils – the evidence of formerly living organisms? It must not come from living matter at all!" (Note: read the entire clip, it's well worth it.)

"Any geologist will tell you, well, most geologists will tell you that OIL IS CREATED BY THE MAGMA OF THE EARTH. The oil wells in Pennsylvania that were pumped out dry at the turn of the century and capped are now filled with oil again." [\[3\]](#) ^[3]

That alone should shut down the idea of going for Net Zero – along with the extremely foolish schemes of air and wind power, at least in the state they are in now. And electric cars! All are ridiculously expensive, are producing a very small fraction of the power we need now, and are damaging the land and killing birds. If we were to eliminate all the power except wind and solar, they would produce a mere 4% of the energy we need today.

Then there is the issue of CARBON. The world is programmed (again *via* Newspeak) to believe carbon is BAD. According to **News of Medical Life Sciences**, "The human body is approximately 99% comprised of just six elements: Oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, calcium, and phosphorus". Oh dear, that should make you go jump off a very high cliff to save the Earth's climate because of your body's carbon percentage alone. And, according to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) "Carbon dioxide or CO₂ is an essential part of the cycle of life. Without CO₂, plants will die off, and without plants, the earth's biological food chain would be terminally broken. **We cannot live without carbon dioxide.**" (Emphasis in the original) So, either those trying to get rid of carbon want to get rid of us or are beyond stupid. Those making the rules are very intelligent; so, you should be able to conclude what they have in mind (yes, go jump off the cliff or they will help you in other ways. Think diseases, pandemics, and starvation).

To continue explaining the Newspeak, blue smoke and mirrors, gobbledygook, this time re why Net Zero is impossible. In an in-depth report explaining just that, David Wojick from CFACT notes:

- *Renewables cannot be made reliable with storage so their penetration must be constrained and managed.*
- *Grid scale storage at the scale needed to replace fossil fuels with wind and solar is impossibly expensive. Even assuming fantastic price reductions, analysis shows the cost of the required battery storage still nearly equals the \$23 trillion annual American GDP.*
- *We now know that the battery storage for the entire American grid is impossibly expensive ... Based on his work, which only covered 48 states, our working estimate of the required storage is an amazing 250 million MWh. America today has less than 20 thousand MWh of grid scale battery storage, which is next to nothing. Grid*

scale batteries today cost around \$700,000 a MWh. For 250 million MWh we get an astronomical total cost of \$175 trillion dollars just to replace today's fossil fuel generated electricity needs with wind and solar. Even the fantastically low-cost estimates that some people are proposing puts the cost around the total GDP of America. Even worse, if we get the electric cars the Biden Administration is calling for, these astronomical numbers could easily double.

On top of those, he adds *"America's grid is steadily becoming more and more unreliable. The grid is sick and getting sicker."*[\[4\]](#) ^{[\[4\]](#)}

We have pipelines being constructed for no legitimate reason other than to redistribute middle-class income *because* there were just so many fossils to provide us with oil and petroleum. Oops, that isn't so, but there are many more things to do with Sustainable Development and forming a new-world order that are as real as Climate Change (check out Just Transition {goes with Smart and 15-minute cities} in APC's **Activist Handbook**, p.85)

Ask yourself why people would want to construct a pipeline to sequester CO₂ underground in five states when that pipeline will be 1,300 miles long across these states, ripping out, permanently, all the topsoil along it, thus it will no longer provide crops for food, or land for homes, churches, hospitals, playgrounds or anything else. It will cost billions of dollars to do what? Obviously, it is not needed for the purpose we are told it will serve; we have no need to rid the earth of carbon; it is a true fairy tale – and an evil one, to boot. What is the real purpose? In my humble opinion, besides uprooting many people, redistributing our wealth, and making millions of acres forever worse than fallow, it will aid in fulfilling the Wildlands Project.[\[5\]](#) ^{[\[5\]](#)}.

It may not be in your state now – or ever. But you may just want to support, by words, those fighting it. You never know when it will reach you. And if it never does, you are paying for this by way of your tax dollars to provide the strings to feed the non-governmental organizations (and their global elite leaders) who are behind this nasty piece of illusion dressed up as vital to the entire Earth's survival – with lipstick, so you know it's a sow.

© 2023 Kathleen Marquardt – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Kathleen Marquardt: koipolloi@protonmail.com

Footnotes:

1. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/net-zero-coalition> [↑](#)
2. <https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/rare-earth-mining-china-social-environmental-costs> [↑](#)
3. <https://prouty.org/oil.html> [↑](#)
4. <https://www.cfact.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/WOJICKREPORT.pdf> [↑](#)
5. http://www.narlo.org/Wildlands%20project_war.pdf [↑](#)