

The War of the Worlds

Although we are at war, most people don't know it — and no, I don't mean in the MidEast. The war is about our energy future, and the US cost is likely to be in the Trillions of dollars — considerably more than our Middle East foray, or all the bailouts *combined!*

One reason the public is unaware is that the main assault force has yet to land. But our G-2 indicates that the major campaign is imminent: mostly likely to begin shortly after January 21, 2009.

So far events have followed a somewhat traditional game plan, as we have been softened up for some time now in anticipation of the arrival of these troops. The carpet bombing has been from a wide variety of misinformed but well-heeled Hessians, ranging from T. Boone Pickens to WeCanSolveIt.

Because of the **enormous** amounts of money involved, we are arrayed against some *very formidable* forces. One of their main objectives is to impose wind power (their holy grail) on us. To accomplish this mission they've contracted Madison Ave marketers to let us have it with both barrels. At last count they are wielding no less than six (6) different strategies to get us to raise the white flag. Our best defense against this modern warfare is to use Critical Thinking.

An example of the powerful techniques they are employing is a relatively new one called **Social Marketing**. Instead of telling you how their product benefits you, their ploy is to try to convince you that their product is for *the public good*.

Part of this strategy is for these mercenaries to use very carefully selected words like “free, clean, and green” that are designed to elicit your subconscious support for their financial gain. Once you do some Critical Thinking though, it becomes clear that wind power *electricity generation* is NOT really free, clean, or green.

Then there is another relatively new tactic that has become so frequent that it now has a name: **Greenwashing**. The idea here is that a business tries to make themselves look more environmentally friendly than they really are. Wind power is a prime example, as many of their claims are bogus, and will only be realized as such if you put on your thinking cap.

Then there is the concentrated effort to confuse you. (Some might say deceive.) An example is that these hired guns lump all sectors of energy together as if they were one problem. *They are not!*

For instance in the *transportation sector*, energy independence is a worthy goal. In the *electrical power sector*, we've essentially **always had it!** The storm troopers purposely confuse unarmed citizens on this matter, saying things like wind power will reduce our oil dependence. That's just not true.

Camouflage experts as our attackers are, another trick they use is sleight of hand. A common statement you'll hear from these service people is that wind power should be *part* of a solution of our energy issues. This gambit often works as most of the masses desperately want *some* type of fix. Taking advantage of that inclination the commando profiteers morph that desire into a belief that doing *anything* is a good thing. But it's like you desperately wanting to do *something* as your house is burning down, so they hand you a glass of water to help douse the flames.

Another battle plan is **distortion**. A good example is that wind power agents may say that nuclear power plants are terrorist targets. Critical Thinking research reveals that the **facts** are that there have been some **13,000** worldwide operational years with nuclear power facilities, with **zero** terrorist attacks. This isn't just luck, as there are several technical reasons why nuclear reactors are not attractive targets for extremists.

Wind power protagonists don't much like nuclear power — mainly because it's everything wind power isn't. So to discourage the populous from embracing their enemy, they also use **Fear** as a tactic. One example is that they talk about the danger of an accident in transporting spent nuclear fuel. If you check out the tests done by Sandia labs (online), you'll see that this is also blown way out of perspective.

All these schemes are necessary for one fundamental reason: **industrial wind power doesn't make sense**. If it did, then no shots would need to be fired, as the simple facts demonstrating that it does would win the day. But no, marketing tricks are their only hope.

The worst result of this bombardment is that politicians have put on kakis (green) and have fallen in lockstep with the aggressors here. This unholy alliance has resulted in one of the most incompetent ideas in decades: the **Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)**.

The gist of the problem is that these imperial edicts are not only arbitrary and artificial, but they don't really accomplish what they purport to do: **meaningfully reduce fossil fuel emissions**. To add insult to injury, what tiny amounts of CO2 they save are *extraordinarily* expensive. RPS's are laughable, except for the fact that they have become so pervasive and have such dire consequences to innocent civilians, on multiple fronts.

Since the electrical grid is a highly complex matter, most people have no idea why wind power is not really "free, clean, and green." But analogies are often helpful so consider this.

Electrical generation and Transportation are two completely different energy sectors. Unlike the electrical part, the transportation sector does use a LOT of oil related products. Let's say that we agree that (all things being equal) less oil usage by the US would be a good thing.

That would require reducing oil consumption in the *Transportation* sector, which primarily consists of autos, trucks, trains, planes and ships. Let's say that the government, in its wisdom, decided to target the thousands of US marine vessels — which indeed use a considerable amount of oil
(http://www.treehugger.com/files/2007/03/there_is_no_fre.php).

So they come up with a decree: **Ship Renewable Portfolio (SRP)**. What this mandate says is that 20% of all commercial and military ships must exclusively use wind power by 2015. (Why 20%? Why 2015? Who knows: as I said, such numbers are artificial and arbitrary.)

Now carefully consider the consequences of this change. Because of their reliance on sail power all such boats would have to be MUCH smaller than modern vessels, so thousands of new ships would have to be built. In fact one modern cargo ship would need somewhere like a thousand clipper sized ships to carry an equivalent amount of goods. (It's interesting that a similar relationship exists between wind power turbines and a nuclear plant.)

In addition, commercial shipping speeds would be significantly reduced, so inventories (and costs) would need to be increased. The Navy's ability to respond to emergencies quickly would likewise be crippled. Etc. Etc. The costs for all this between ships, port changes, additional personnel required, manpower training, etc. would be **enormous**.

In defense of this absurdity, the government (and their WeCanSolveIt type superiors) will say: *maybe this is true, but we will be meeting our objective — **saving fossil fuel emissions!***

Really? Well let's think about this for a minute. First of all, there will be a significant amount of fossil fuel used in the completely unnecessary construction of thousands of ships. Secondly, because of the unattractive implications wind power will have to the shipping business, many customers will take their trade elsewhere. The result of this would be that airlines, railroads and trucking would ramp up their operations to account for increased traffic. All that would mean much more fossil fuel used by those sources.

So what would be the NET savings? *Unequivocally they would be miniscule.*

And what would be the cost of this SRP fiasco? *Clearly quite large.*

So there you have industrial wind power in a nutshell: **tiny benefits at huge costs.**

But won't reverting to sailing ships create lots of jobs the environmental protagonists will whine? *Wait a minute! **They** said that the WHOLE point of the SRP/RPS was to make a significant dent in fossil fuel emissions, so aren't they completely changing the topic when they bring up "economic opportunity"?* Of course they are: *all's fair in love and war!*

But let's play their new game — then we'll be done with their diversions, right?

Yes, building thousands of new sailing ships will create new jobs in both construction and operation. But is reverting to 18th century employment wise public policy? If so, then we need to give this whole employment business some new thought.

For instance, many things have been invented in the last century that were specifically designed to **save** manpower. So if we are so desperate for jobs, *just reverse the process!* Here's an example: **as part of SRP/RPS the government should outlaw all bulldozers.**

Considering that there are thousands of bulldozers, and that each does the work of ten men, something like a **hundred thousand** new jobs will instantly be created. And, as a bonus, since these bulldozers use fossil fuels, we'll cut back on CO2 in the process!

If you think that these employment ideas, or SRP (or RPS) plans makes sense, then you should seriously consider joining Greenpeace, the Sierra Club or the Union of Concerned Scientists. They are all advocating such medieval solutions to our modern energy problems.

Paul Revere I'm not, but you ignore this warning at your extreme peril. So when the occupying forces show up to take over your town, your way of life, and your pocketbook, just remember who you have to thank.

Knowledge is power so if you want to arm yourself see WindPowerfacts.Info.

John Droz, jr.
12/10/08