

Raymond Leury: You can find Peter's book at [Climate Restoration: The Only Future That Will Sustain the Human Race: Fiekowsky, Peter, Douglis, Carole: 9781953943101: Books - Amazon.ca](#)

David Pollock: what is your take on the safety and permanence of iron fertilization of the ocean thoughts about unintended consequences

Richard van der Jagt: I was born at 314 ppm!

Richard van der Jagt: Q: would you agree that humanity's goal should be zero emissions?

Paul Beckwith: We are rising at about 30 Gt per year. Don't we have to remove 90 Gt per year to get net removal of 60 GT per year?

Richard van der Jagt: As Bill McKibben writes, we need to stop burning things (fossil fuels, coal etc) and convert other forms of energy such as wind, solar and geothermal etc to power our world. Governments that have gone that route have a stronger economy and a healthier population

David Pollock: Hard to say we know how to do it - except in the narrowest sense but the chemical and biological systems operating throughout oceans for example are extremely complex interactions and it would take a massive experiment to know how our interventions would actually interact and how much might this slow other fully permanent reductions in fossil fuel use bring?

Art Hunter: (Q) We are now at the peak of species diversity on the planet and starting down the 6th extinction event since the big bang. In one million years or more, between each extinction, much can happen and homo-erectus may not evolve in this next cycle. Nature knows how to eliminate badly behaving species. Why should humanity do anything to extend our survival given the enormous power of nature?

Raymond Leury: Q: Your book was written in 2022 and you said there are significant updates since then. Can you briefly list the main areas of update?

Richard van der Jagt: Carbon removal is a sham and highly inefficient. Technically it does not work and if anything, helps in the extraction of fossil fuels

Paul Beckwith: Why don't we get China to do it. China is a nation of engineers in charge (engineering state) as opposed to US (lawyerly society) and Canada.

Claude Buettner: Reacted to "Why don't we get Chi..." with 👍

Richard van der Jagt: DAC is also been shown to be a sham , and is actually , just like Carbon removal, another subsidy to the fossil fuel industry

Raymond Leury: Fertilization will provide food for fish, wouldn't the extra fish harvest be enough to pay for the fertilization?

Richard van der Jagt: The Climate Action Network is strongly against DAC and Carbon capture

David Pollock: please comment on findings of NOAA below: Harmful algal blooms
Deep-water oxygen depletion from sinking biomass
Food-web disruption
Toxic species shifts
Altered nutrient distribution affecting distant ecosystems
The NOAA modeling program explicitly studies these risks because they are considered likely at scale.

David Pollock: Trying to understand the argument: 1. how many projects to reduce by 10 parts per billion co2

John Hollins: Have any experiments been conducted? Is there any US agency left with a budget that could do an experiment?

Paul Beckwith: Ocean stratification is greatly accelerating climate change - I posted a new video an hour ago: is there a reduction of downwelling eddies over time due to ocean changes?

Richard van der Jagt: the Chinese are far, far ahead in terms of producing and using renewables

David Pollock: What These Experiments Found (Consistent Across All 13)
1. Iron reliably triggers large phytoplankton blooms
This part works extremely well — blooms can be seen from satellites.
2. Only a small fraction of carbon sinks deep enough to count as long-term removal
Most carbon: gets eaten, decomposes, resurfaces or is respired back into CO₂ within months to years

Anitra Thorhaug: I can ask about the total amount from other carbon capture methods.