Energy Independence for Britain: A Practical Alternative to the Current Net Zero Dogma

21 May 2025

The UK has become trapped in a global energy market that it doesn't control — paying volatile international prices, despite having abundant domestic resources. We are told that Net Zero is urgent and non-negotiable, yet this comes at the cost of energy security, affordability, and competitiveness — with **no measurable global benefit**, since the UK accounts for just **1% of global CO_2 emissions**.

This report considers an **alternative path**: a strategic pause, not on the **principle** of decarbonisation, but on the **methods and timescales**. It asks whether the UK could — with existing and potential resources — regain control of its energy supply, reduce costs, and transition to renewables **on its own terms**.

---

1 Re-Adopt Fossil Fuels for the Majority of Demand

Feasibility: **Moderate to High**

- North Sea oil and gas reserves still exist — with further potential through renewed exploration.
- Shale gas and deep coal are technically recoverable with modern methods.
- Infrastructure for gas-fired power already exists and can be scaled up.
- Recommissioning mothballed gas or coal plants could provide security of supply.

Challenges:

- Environmental regulations designed for Net Zero make new fossil fuel projects economically unattractive.
- Existing tax regimes penalise domestic extraction.
- Public opposition to fracking and coal lingers.

Solutions:

- Suspend or reform Net Zero-linked regulations and offer incentives for domestic production.
- Create a sovereign energy body to coordinate domestic fossil fuel supply.
- Invest in cleaner fossil technology (e.g., carbon capture) **only when the return on investment justifies it**, not to appease carbon accounting models.

☀ 2 Refocus Renewables on Local, Decentralised Use

Feasibility: **High**

- Domestic solar, battery storage, and micro-wind turbines require little or no grid upgrade.
- Rooftop solar deployment is simple, scalable, and cost-effective — particularly for new builds or public sector estates.
- Local energy production reduces peak demand on the national grid.

Challenges:

- Cannot meet full national demand or provide consistent baseload energy.
- Current incentives skew towards large-scale offshore projects and feed-in tariffs for commercial producers.

Solutions:

- Redirect subsidies away from megaprojects towards individual households and SMEs.
- Allow local authorities to co-own generation and sell surplus to nearby consumers.
- Encourage pairing solar with **domestic battery storage** to maximise independence.

---

3 Isolate from International Pricing via Nationalisation or Strategic Market Reform

Feasibility: **Technically High** (but **Practically Complex**)

- A public energy provider could sell electricity and gas to UK users at or near production cost.
- Nationalising critical infrastructure (or creating a state-run competitor) would restore pricing control.
- UK-based extraction and generation could be ring-fenced for domestic consumption.

Challenges:

- Cost of buying out private sector assets would be high — politically explosive.
- Risk of trade disputes under WTO and bilateral agreements.
- Energy multinationals may reduce UK investment.

Solutions:

- Instead of full nationalisation, create a **state-owned competitor** that sets the benchmark price — like EDF in France.

- Introduce legislation to **prioritise domestic supply at stable prices**, then export surplus at market rates.
- Levy windfall taxes on private operators who choose to sell to international markets during domestic shortages.

---

4 Plan a Long-Term, Affordable Transition Funded by Economic Growth

Feasibility: **Very High**

- Fossil fuel revenues and lower energy costs can fund a **sovereign Energy Independence Fund**.
- As technology matures, invest in long-term solutions: **nuclear (SMRs), tidal, geothermal**, and battery storage.
- A gradual ramp-up avoids the "boom and bust" approach of green subsidies and panic-led policy changes.

Challenges:

- Temptation to raid the fund for short-term political wins.
- Public scepticism over future planning after decades of failed infrastructure promises.

Solutions:

- Legislate to ring-fence energy revenues with **multi-year planning cycles** and independent oversight.
- Keep Net Zero as an **aspiration**, not a legally binding straitjacket.
- Make the UK a **leader in pragmatic innovation**, not just virtue-signalling targets.

🔚 Conclusion: Think Big. Think British.

Britain does not have to choose between **Net Zero extremism** and **energy chaos**. There is a middle way — one of **sovereignty, affordability, and future readiness**.

By:

- Reclaiming domestic fossil fuel use
- Focusing renewables where they work best (locally)
- Reforming our market to favour British consumers
- And planning a **measured**, cost-effective transition

…we can power Britain with British energy — while giving the public **certainty**, businesses **competitive rates**, and future generations a **stronger foundation**.

This is not about **climate denial**. It's about **climate realism** — and national self-respect.

Disclaimer:
This article has been independently written and published by *No Bull Politics*, with research assistance from AI tools to enhance accuracy and objectivity. It reflects the views and analysis of the publisher and is **not affiliated with any political party, campaign, or organisation**. All opinions expressed are intended to provoke constructive discussion and critical thinking around public policy and national strategy.

❓ Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Q1: "You can't just walk away from Net Zero –

we've legally committed to it!"

A: Laws can be amended, repealed, or deferred – particularly when economic stability or national security is at stake. Net Zero is a policy choice, not a divine commandment. A revised timeline with a more pragmatic pathway doesn't mean abandoning environmental goals, just restoring democratic oversight and economic sanity.

Q2: "Burning more fossil fuels will worsen climate change and hurt Britain's global reputation."

A: The UK accounts for **just 1% of global emissions**. Even eliminating our entire footprint would have **no measurable effect** on global temperatures. Our moral reputation isn't improved by impoverishing ourselves while China and India expand emissions year-on-year. Leadership begins with **energy security and realism**, not self-sacrifice.

Q3: "Fracking and new oil fields are unsafe and deeply unpopular."

A: Modern extraction methods are significantly safer than in the past. Much of the opposition is ideological. A well-informed public given clear evidence, local benefit guarantees, and environmental safeguards can be persuaded. Unpopularity is not a technical barrier; it's a political management issue.

Q4: "Nationalising energy would be too expensive

and disrupt investment."

A: Total nationalisation is not essential. A **state-owned competitor** could achieve pricing stability while retaining private sector diversity. Many countries (e.g. France, Norway) use this model successfully. Strategic control over key assets ensures investment serves national interests — not just shareholder returns.

Q5: "Focusing only on local renewables isn't enough to power the UK."

A: Correct — **this report doesn't suggest abandoning central generation**. It proposes *rebalancing* toward local generation for efficiency and independence, while fossil fuels (and eventually nuclear) continue to meet national baseload demand. It's not either/or — it's both/and, with smarter prioritisation.

Q6: "This sounds like going backwards — we should be modernising!"

A: Energy independence, domestic supply chains, and competitive pricing **are modernisation** — far more than over-reliance on volatile imports and ideological targets. Progress means doing what works best for Britain, not copying the failures of others under the banner of global conformity.

Q7: "Isn't this just climate denial in disguise?"

A: Not at all. This proposal accepts climate change exists — but rejects **Net Zero extremism** as the only valid response. The UK should decarbonise **gradually**, affordably, and in alignment with national priorities, not under pressure from supranational institutions or activist lobbies.