

“All of the Above” — a Pig in a Poke

Essentially everyone supports investigating alternative energy options... However, just because an energy source is “alternative” or “renewable” does not mean that it should get a free pass from scientific scrutiny.

In a properly designed energy policy the *only* alternatives that should be allowed on the Grid (a privilege, not an entitlement), are those that have genuine scientific proof that they are a **net societal benefit**.

Phrased another way, that would mean we should only accept alternative energy sources that are: **a)** technically sound [e.g. reliable], **b)** low cost, *and* **c)** environmentally friendly.

On the surface, the “All of the Above” slogan sounds innocent enough, and even has a ring of reasonableness to it.

However, this lobbyist sales pitch warrants some deeper thought. Specifically, does an "All of the Above" policy *really* make sense? Consider:

- #1 - When we include ALL energy options, that would mean that **unreliable** alternative sources would be put on the Grid.
- #2 - When we include ALL energy options, that would mean **very expensive** alternative sources would be put on the Grid.
- #3 - When we include ALL options, that would mean **environmentally destructive** alternative sources of energy would be put on the Grid.

Do ANY of those really make sense? *How do we advance our economy, our society, our national security, by allowing **unreliable, expensive, and environmentally detrimental** alternative power sources to be on the grid?*

There is a BETTER path, *and* one that is in the public interest.

An "**All of the Sensible**" energy slogan would go a LONG way towards putting reasonableness in our energy policy, Further, it would send the message that citizens, businesses and the environment are a top priority for legislators.

What are our “sensible” energy choices? Well that is exactly the conversation we should be having — but are not.

I would posit that “sensible” alternative electrical energy sources are those that are proven to have a **net societal benefit**, so let the discussion begin!

john droz, jr. physicist North Carolina aaprjohn(at)northnet.org 12-2-19

[Note: see [this](#) for a more detailed explanation of the problem with this mantra.]