

A photograph of several large white wind turbines in a residential area. The turbines are tall and have three blades each. In the foreground, there is a two-story white house with dark shutters, a utility pole with power lines, and some trees. The sky is a clear, pale blue. The text "getting up to speed on Wind Power" is overlaid in white, bold, sans-serif font.

getting
up to speed
on
Wind Power

Background: Following the bad example of the Federal Government, several states have implemented a **Renewable Portfolio Standard** (RPS). In short this policy **mandates** that the state quickly add a certain percentage of “renewable” energy sources to their electrical supply grid. These political mandates are claimed to be contributions towards reduction of CO2 emissions. The fact is that wind power does *not* materially help with global warming.

The theory of using more “renewable” forms of energy seems OK on the surface, but the devil is in the details. For example, hydro power (the most inexpensive and least CO2 polluting source of electrical energy we have), has been injudiciously *excluded* from consideration because some environmentalists don’t like what hydro dams do to fish for instance.

Nuclear energy could also technically be called a “renewable” energy, and is by far the most powerful electrical energy option we have. Yet that also has been arbitrarily excluded from this political equation because of concerns about things like what to do with spent fuel.

The fact is that ALL energy sources have shortcomings, but we would be MUCH better off trying to solve the issues with sources that genuinely provide Base Load electricity, rather than spending hundreds of billions of dollars supporting things like wind power that don’t.

Although this summary was written from the perspective of NYS residents, since a similar (or worse) situation exists in many other states, the material discussed here is almost always applicable to any region of the country. Here is an excellent critique of the RPS concept by Robert J. Michaels PhD <<<http://tinyurl.com/5zxvs2>>>.

Question 1: How many fossil fuel facilities have been shut down, or not been built, due to the 50,000± worldwide wind turbines already added to various grids? *Answer:* **None.**

Question 2: How much CO2 has been saved due to these 50,000 worldwide wind turbines? *Answer:* **Almost none.** What little has been saved has been prohibitively expensive.

Solutions: Federal and state governments should back off of exorbitant incentives for “renewables,” and all RPS states should enact a **one year moratorium** on industrial wind power projects so their RPS mandate can be reformulated into more sensible energy plans.

Some Supporting Information:

To understand the merits or liabilities of proposed solutions, a reader needs to have a *thorough understanding* of the issue at stake. Regarding wind power, most people are much more familiar with the promoters’ position, so to balance things out a bit, this package is about the other side.

The perspectives that I am coming from here are that:

- as a scientist I want to see **technically sound** solutions of our energy situation, and
 - I am a person **strongly** and **genuinely** concerned about the environment.
-

I have read over **500** reports, studies, and articles — mostly by independent experts — and have *unequivocally* concluded that wind power doesn’t do what it is advertised to do.

Another way of phrasing this is:

- 1) wind power is **not** a scientifically sound solution to help with global warming, or to provide Base Load electrical power. and
- 2) wind power is **not** a commercially viable source of energy on its own, and
- 3) wind power is **not** environmentally responsible.

*Those three basic criteria haven’t been selected to make wind power look bad, but are what should be used to evaluate the legitimacy and desirability of **any** source of energy.*

Not surprisingly (due to its complexity) most people have made a **superficial** assessment of the energy situation, that typically goes something like this:

- 1) the “Global Warming Theory” is scientifically accurate, and man-made;
- 2) as such we need to make serious reductions in CO₂, immediately;
- 3) fossil fuel electrical facilities produce lots of CO₂;
- 4) the wind is free and renewable;
- 5) there isn’t any significant CO₂ generation associated with wind power;
- 6) wind power will replace fossil fuel power and result in meaningful CO₂ reductions;
- 7) wind power is environmentally benign; and
- 8) wind power is now priced competitively with conventional power.

Conclusion: wind power will be able to consequentially reduce CO₂ emissions by reducing fossil fuel usage, while being economical, and environmentally friendly.

All this seems logical at first glance. *But scientists don’t make determinations by first glance impressions.* Doing **real research** into this matter will show that there are serious errors in the above postulation, which (not surprisingly) result in an **erroneous** conclusion.

The most fatal flaw is the assumption that any “renewable” source of energy is “better” than any fossil fuel source. **This is totally false.**

All right, you don’t have the time to review all 500 reports, but you’d like me to pass on the more salient ones I’ve read. Fine. Even in this abbreviated version, industrial wind power is still a *complex* matter. I’m willing to digest things for you, and have only two requests:

- 1 - that you are truly willing to **spend the time** (several hours) to **carefully** read what are the some of the best materials, that I have painstakingly referenced for you here, and
- 2 - that you are **open-minded** and really want to get to the **truth** of this matter.

Of course having a problem with one or both of these is exactly why few citizens, and almost no politicians, or environmental groups really know much of anything about this.

OK, you are in agreement. I’ve boiled down the 500± studies, reports and articles I’ve read, into a handful. Below is my recommended outline for going through them. Lastly, to save you time, I’ve also tried to make all the url links in this package to be clickable. Let’s do it.

Required Minimum Reading:

Read all articles listed in *Information Sources* (attached), but particularly those below. (Please remember that these technical discussions must be read very **carefully**.) [Here are definitions of some frequently used terms: <<<http://www.aweo.org/windunits.html>>>.]

1 - Overview of Industrial Wind Power —

- a) “An Executive Summary” (attached: a one page summary of the situation)
- b) “Industrial Wind — A Bill of Goods” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2oz53f>>>
- c) “A Problem With Wind Power” <<<http://tinyurl.com/3bhvt6>>>
- d) “Wind Power Primer”(PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/5ot4w2>>>
- e) “Where is Energy Going” (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/3623en>>>.

2 - re Wind Power not being Scientifically Sound —

- a) NAS “Environmental Impacts of Wind-Energy Projects” (PDF) <<http://www.nap.edu/nap-cgi/report.cgi?record_id=11935&type=pdfxsum>>
- b) “Wind Energy: Facts and Fiction” (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/38gg26>>>
- c) “Options for Coal Fired Power Plants in Ontario” (esp ¶ #5.2 thru 5.4, & #8.4) [PDF] <<http://www.cns-snc.ca/media/CNS_Position_Papers/Ontario_coal.pdf>>
- d) “Reduction in CO₂ Emissions” (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/5q8d8o>>>
- e) “Tilting at Windmills” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2omsn8>>>

3 - re Wind Power not being Economically Viable on its Own —

- a) “Big Money Discovers Wind Power” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2vhaj4>>>
- b) “Distorting the Wealth of Nature” <<<http://tinyurl.com/367nmm>>>
- c) “Calculating the Real Cost of Industrial Wind Power”
<<http://essexcountywind.files.wordpress.com/2007/12/wind_cost_report-pdf>>
- d) “Money Blowing in the Wind” <<<http://www.cmaq.net/en/node/28374>>>
- e) “Wind Power: Facts or Blowing Hot Air?” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2pyya4>>>.

4 - re Wind Power not being Environmentally Responsible —

- a) “Problems of Wind Power” <<<http://www.ncpa.org/studies/renew/renew2e.html>>>
- b) “The Overlooked Environmental Cost of Wind” <<<http://tinyurl.com/5d37t7>>>
- c) Evaluation of Environmental Noise (rev 2): <<<http://tinyurl.com/32g3z9>>>
- d) “Nuclear and Renewable Heresies” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2q6b6w>>>
- e) Wind Turbine Syndrome info <<<http://www.ninapierpont.com/?s=wind>>>.

The Manhattan Institute recently put out an excellent paper “Energy and Environmental Myths & Facts” (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/65kanx>>>.

After getting a better understanding of the truth about wind power, some people then ask “but shouldn’t we be doing *something* about global warming?”

My personal belief is **YES**, and if we are serious about it our actions need to be:

- 1) *aggressive*,
- 2) *effective*, and
- 3) *sensible*.

Wind Power is *none* of these, and is an illusionary “solution” that seriously distracts from our time and money being directed to some real answers (e.g. see below). Because of this, **supporters of wind power are actually encouraging the continuation of global warming:**

- a) “An Environmental Choice” (attached: some lesser known environmental impacts).
- b) The MIT Report on GeoThermal <<<http://tinyurl.com/47w25e>>>.
- c) Decentralization and energy recovery (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/389k3o>>>.
- d) “The Future Environment for the Energy Business” <<<http://tinyurl.com/3yew3u>>>.
- e) “Stabilization Wedges Theory...” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2zf6dt>>>.

[Despite the title of this widely accepted *theory* saying “...with *Current Technologies*” the wind wedge *assumes* the nonexistent commercially feasible widespread capability to store industrial wind power energy. Most other wedges appear to have validity.]

Do We Learn From The Experiences of Others?

1 - The Canadian province of Alberta invested **heavily** into wind power — now they are reverting back to conventional fossil fuel power plants. “We now have so much wind power generation that we need to fall back on reliable sources of power,” said Peter Hunt, an Enmax spokesman. “The problem with wind power is that the wind doesn’t blow all the time, so the greater percentage of the system depends on wind, the more vulnerable to disruption the system becomes when the wind stops blowing.”

These are words of a major wind power **developer** and proponent. The most important word he said was “**reliable**”. The second significant comment was: adding wind power makes the grid “**vulnerable to disruption**” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2ey8ce>>>. *Think about it.*

2 - French president M. Sarkozy recently announced an end to all wind power developments in rural France. And in the inimitable way the French have of phrasing things eloquently, Sarkozy (speaking of his neighbors’ wind power developments) said “Frankly, when I see some European countries, it doesn’t make me envious”: <<<http://tinyurl.com/2j5p9n>>>.

What's The Matter With This Picture?

Regarding the wind power situation, many environmental groups are pleased with the fact that they are *finally* allies with both politicians and big business on an important issue.

But shouldn't a red light be going on somewhere? [This is something like the U. S. and Iran and North Korea all agreeing on a major policy matter. Does that sound right either?]

An interesting article ("Baptists aligned with Bootleggers") discusses this unusual situation <<<http://www.cei.org/gencon/029,03948.cfm>>>. *How long is it going to take before these "environmentalists" realize that they have been duped, and are now the unwitting lackeys in helping multi-national companies make billions in profits, **while pillaging the environment?***

Since when is it the position of a true environmentalist that they accept **significant** known environmental problems, in the *hope* of some *theoretical* gain in another area? This is a heresy and the John Muirs of environmental history are turning in their graves.

Speaking of Mr. Muir, he wrote: "Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wildness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life... *These temple-destroyers, devotees of ravaging commercialism, seem to have a perfect contempt for Nature, and instead of lifting their eyes to the God of the mountains, lift them to the Almighty Dollar.*" What foresight!

Here's a test: which environmental organization has the following as their mantra —

"An ever expanding body of research has demonstrated that environmental aesthetic values are shared among the general population. This research finds that such values are not idiosyncratic, random, or arbitrary. For example, millions of people visit Niagara Falls for a shared appreciation of its beauty."

"Aesthetic impact occurs when there is a detrimental effect on the *perceived* beauty of a place. Significant aesthetic impacts are those that may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of an inventoried resource, or one that impairs the character or quality of such a place."

Although these paragraphs *should* be the keystone of almost all environmental groups, the disturbing answer is none. These are actually the insightful words of NYS DEC: <<http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/visual2000.pdf>>.

I ask you: why isn't this perspective a keystone to any national environmental group (like the Sierra Club)? And if it is, then how can it be so cavalierly obliterated in exchange for the unproven hope that wind power may do a tiny bit towards helping with global warming?

A Key Part of the Solution:

As we stated in the beginning, the federal government and all states should enact a **one year moratorium** on industrial wind power projects until RPS can be reformulated in a more sound scientific, economic and environmental fashion.

There is nothing wrong with the *objective* of saving CO2, just like in the "Alicia in Wonderland" ditty I wrote (attached: which is an analogy of the RPS foolishness) there is nothing wrong with the *objective* of losing excess weight.

It's all about the execution — i.e. "the devil is in the details." Most current RPS's are impossible to sensibly meet (like having to lose 20 pounds in two weeks), and only result in foolish and unhealthy choices being made. **These need to be fixed.**

Summary (paraphrasing Mr. Boone):

Our society has much the same dependence upon power from fossil fuel combustion as a three-pack-a-day Marlboro smoker has with nicotine. Although each gets a “lift” from the experience, the evidence for both demonstrates dire health and quality of life risks resulting from this behavior.

Attempting to utilize industrial windplants to reduce dependence on fossil fuels is the same as the smoker who seeks to mitigate the dangers of smoking by switching to three daily packs of Marlboro Lites.

If the wind industry were fully deployed in the US (with one hundred thousand or more wind plants), an **increasing** number of fossil fuel facilities will still be puffing away despite all the gigantic wind turbines killing wildlife, depreciating historically significant locations, degrading natural sanctuaries, desecrating aesthetically pleasing views, devaluing nearby property, and creating major nuisances for proximate neighbors (including health effects).

And after enduring all this, US citizens and businesses will then be awarded higher utility and tax rates and miniscule reductions in CO2. **This is not enlightened public policy!**

Intelligent, short-range solutions to the problems of global warming and air quality must combine such things as effective conservation efforts, with much higher efficiency standards (for fossil fuel facilities and major energy utilizing products).

This is heavy lifting indeed for the most wasteful culture in the history of the planet. The wind industry is a **placebo solution** to these problems, distracting from the necessary level of discourse — and political action — for achieving genuinely functional responses.

For further information please contact:

John Droz, jr.
physicist Brantingham Lake, NY
“aaprjohn@northnet.org” 315-348-8428
6/15/08



Wind Power: An Executive Summary

The U.S. may soon get TWO MILLION wind towers <<<http://tinyurl.com/yjug95>>>.

If this concerns you, keep reading. (FYI, I am a physicist who has a 20+ year track record of interest in our environment in a variety of areas [like water quality]. I live on a lake in the Adirondack Mountains [NY], as communing with nature is one of my highest priorities.)

At first glance, wind power seems to be a potentially good thing: a clean, renewable source of energy, etc. But scientists don't make decisions based on first glance impressions.

To come to a meaningful understanding of complex matters like wind power, open-minded people need to do a thorough examination of **all** major components of the issue, plus do a review of accumulated evidence to date (e.g. from wind power experiences in Europe).

Such an analysis will lead to two fundamental conclusions:

- 1) there is **no meaningful environmental benefit** to industrial wind power, and
 - 2) it is being promoted because it is an **extremely lucrative business opportunity**.
- Below is a brief overview as to why these are so.

There is no real environmental benefit as: **a)** wind is an unpredictable commodity. **b)** Output from any group of wind projects can and will go to zero on many occasions. **c)** Energy generated from industrial wind power can not be economically stored.

These three facts lead us to conclude that wind power will not truly provide what is known as Base Load electrical power. And due to their complexity, nuclear and coal-fired power plants can't simply be "turned down" when wind power is available. Sources like hydro power (a clean, low cost energy source) are often cut back instead. Since coal-fired power plants must operate at near full capacity 24/7 — *no consequential emissions are reduced!*

This is a lucrative business opportunity as: **a)** take the cost to build and erect a typical wind tower, **b)** subtract the government provided financial incentives (your money). **c)** Then the government requires the local utility to buy ALL of the electricity generated (needed or not) and to pay a *premium* rate (your money). **d)** After taking all of these numbers into account, each turbine turns out to be a **government guaranteed 25%± per year income generator**.

How did this all happen? Basically: **a)** global warming has become a hot political item, **b)** so the US Congress decided that they had to do *something* to show that they were "addressing the problem". **c)** Accurately sensing an opportunity to tap into some **big** money, the wind power special interest lobby heavily influenced the process (not that unusual).

The bottom line is that the generous financial incentives offered were NOT about helping the environment, **or** about benefiting taxpayers or ratepayers. It is a political "solution" that was principally designed to enrich influential multi-national conglomerates who wanted to feed at the government trough. Many states then followed the bad example set by the federal government by issuing well-intentioned, but poorly thought out RPS (Renewable Portfolio Standard): edicts that are not scientifically, financially, or environmentally sound.

When a wind power developer targets a community, their objective is to put up as many 25% *income* generators as possible. To achieve this they employ three effective strategies: **1)** they not only take advantage of the global warming concern that is prevalent, they make it into a *patriotic* matter, **2)** they know that most people do not understand the complexities of the wind power issue, so they make specious claims, and **3)** they rely on the support they get from local people that they essentially buy off — *with taxpayer money!*

Since this problem was created by politicians, it should be fixed by politicians. That will only happen when citizens get informed, and then subsequently demand a change. RPS's should be rewritten to make scientific, financial and environmental sense.

An Environmental Choice

For the sake of this discussion, let's just assume that we are in agreement on this much: **a)** that there IS such a thing as global warming, **b)** that it IS mostly man-made, and **c)** that we need to do something **meaningful** about it, ASAP. OK, so what should we do?

Well, how about industrial wind power?

On the surface wind power seems to be a potentially good thing: a renewable, clean, and free source of energy. And industrial wind power developers promote it by saying that it will meaningfully reduce emissions from fossil fuel utility plants. *Sounds good!*

Well, the developers' promise turns out to be inaccurate — but let's just pretend that it **is** true. The question still remains: *is wind power a good environmental (and financial) choice?*

The fact is that we actually have **several** options available to us to deal with our energy consumption and global warming problems. To keep it simple here, we will look at just two. Then you decide which is better for you, your community, and our planet.

CHOICE #1: Industrial Wind Facilities -----

The US government would like to have wind power supply about 5% of our current usage of electricity. This would require *at least* 100,000 1.5 MW wind turbines (note that some estimates say two **MILLION** are needed). FYI, there are about 50,000 now in use worldwide.

Here are just **some** of the consequences and costs per 100,000± industrial wind turbines — The environmental effects of: ➔ building hundreds of miles of roads, etc.; ➔ removing **hundreds of thousands** of trees, etc.; ➔ excavating **35± million** truck loads of earth (plus bedrock dynamiting), etc. (e.g. for tower bases); ➔ the production & delivery of **160± billion** pounds of concrete (e.g. for tower bases); ➔ the manufacture & delivery of **30± billion** pounds of steel (for the towers); ➔ the refinement & delivery of **200± million** gallons of oil (each turbine uses oil); ➔ the gas used and exhausts emitted for all other transportation; ➔ having to build hundreds of miles of new transmission lines, (and all of the tree loss, excavation, concrete, gas, etc. that goes along with these lines), etc.

The cost to taxpayers between government subsidies and higher electric rates: \$100± Billion
The cost to citizens for the loss of natural views, wildlife, peace & quiet: **PRICELESS!**

CHOICE #2: Ban Most Incandescent Light Bulbs -----

*This isn't a perfect choice — none are — but just doing this would save **MORE** than the energy generated by **100,000±** wind towers (i.e. twice the amount currently on the planet)!*

[Surprisingly, most light bulb manufacturers favor this (e.g. *NY Times*: March 14, 2007 "A US Alliance to Update the Light Bulb") <<<http://tinyurl.com/2x8ktg>>>.]

A variation of Choice #2 is that the government could put a \$3 tax on every incandescent bulb sold. Then apply the subsidy money earmarked for wind power to *genuinely* benefit the environment (e.g. alternative energy research) and we could make some *real* progress here.

Late in 2007 the federal government acknowledged the validity of this idea and outlawed incandescent light bulbs as of 2020. **2020!** This is typical of the mentality of many of the people who support wind power: they talk the talk, but don't walk the walk. If Congress was serious about global warming they wouldn't endorse 12 more years of energy wastefulness, and would have done something meaningful (like the tax), *immediately*.

Which do you think is the simplest, least expensive, and best environmental choice?

Alica in Wonderland

Alica is a normal, active 24 year old. Although she is a bit overweight (140 lbs. at 5'6"), she doesn't have any other serious health issues.

That's why she was rather surprised at her physical checkup, how concerned her doctor was. After doing his basic checks, he sternly spoke to her at length about several problems that excess weight is connected to (diabetes, heart complications, earlier mortality, etc.).

Alica had been at this weight for years, so asked him why he hadn't said something more about this before.

He somewhat apologetically acknowledged that he just came back from a national convention and was anxious to try out a new idea he had heard was being done by doctors in other states. "Alica, the solution for you is RPS."

Of course Alica had no clue as to what that was. Seeing her puzzled look, the doctor volunteered further explanation: "RPS is '**R**apid **P**edamorphic **S**olution'."

Alica: "Oh, OK."

"It's simple!" he said. "RPS dictates that you must lose **20 pounds in two weeks.**"

Alica was stunned. "*Twenty pounds in **two** weeks?* That's impossible."

But the doctor was prepared. "Not really. At this convention they were promoting a miracle solution. It's called 'Fat Dissolver'. It's been used in Europe and people there love it."

"Really? How does it work?"

"Well, they've known for some time that an element of a fat molecule is CO₂. The Fat Dissolver is supposed to reduce CO₂, and the theory is that reduction will result in body fat simply dissipating. It's that easy. So, as surprising as it may seem, RPS can be achieved **if** you use the Fat Dissolver."

But Alica had a BS in Biology and wasn't just going to just accept this at face value. "Has the FDA approved the Fat Dissolver?" "Not yet, but they are looking at it."

"Well then what research has been done to prove that it works?" she asked.

"The manufacturer assures us that it works as advertised. And those people in Europe are smart cookies. They wouldn't be buying stuff that doesn't work."

"How much does it cost?" she inquired.

"I have a large supply that I picked up at the convention, so I got a quantity discount. Your initial startup cost is only \$5000."

"*Five thousand dollars?*"

"Yes, but your life is at stake here. How much is saving your life worth? Hey, and anyway, your insurance companies will pay for 90% of it."

“Yeah, but **five thousand dollars?**”

“Full disclosure requires that I tell you that there is an additional \$100 per month.”

“What? For how long?”

“For life. Once you stop using the Fat Dissolver, those pesky CO₂'s will come back.”

“You're pulling my leg here right?”

“Not at all. How about trying it out, I have some right here. Two tablespoons a day, before breakfast.” He gives her a sample.

“Oh my god that tastes absolutely *horrible!* It's just like turpentine!”

“Hmmm. Taste is a subjective thing. Some people really like how it tastes.”

“*There are people who like the taste of turpentine?*”

“Sure. Some people like it so much that they have signed on to sell it.”

“Sell it? How does that work?”

“Well the developers of Fat Dissolver lease some product to interested local people, who then sell it to their community.”

“Is that really worth someone's time to do?”

“Absolutely, there's **big money** to be made with the Fat Dissolver. With RPS catching on, and the insurance companies onboard, this is going to be all the rage. Take my word for it, everybody's going to be doing RPS.”

“So there will be people out there in my community saying lots of good things about the Fat Dissolver, not because they have any information that it works, but because they have a financial interest in it? Got it, thanks for the heads up.”

She continued: “But back to the science here, why can't I lose this weight by more exercise along with calorie conservation?”

“That's old school thinking. Besides it wouldn't happen fast enough, and time is of the essence. You are at serious risk here — your world could come to an end!”

“Well if my situation is so serious, what about surgery?”

“That isn't a good option for someone like yourself. There are known risks to that.”

“But aren't there risks for the Fat Dissolver?”

“The manufacturer says no, so were going to take the optimistic position here.”

“What's actually in this Fat Dissolver stuff?”

“Not really sure. It's a proprietary business, so you can understand that they wouldn't want to give away trade secrets. GE is involved, though, and they're a reputable company.”

“So if I take this terrible swill as required, the upside is that you’re telling me I’m guaranteed to get rid of enough CO22 so that I will lose the 20 pounds in two weeks?”

“Sorry, I should have made that clear. Everybody’s body chemistry is different, so you can see why the developers can’t be expected to make any guarantees.”

“You’re the doctor here, but let me see if I understand RPS and its implications:

- 1) my life is suddenly in immediate peril due to my being 20 pounds overweight,
- 2) I have to get rid of those 20 pounds in two weeks, or else my life is likely doomed to come to an abrupt and catastrophic end,
- 3) I can’t resort to surgery as that is too risky,
- 4) exercise and diet won’t work,
- 5) it’s a theory that reducing CO22 will dissipate body fat,
- 6) you are assuring me that the Fat Dissolver will consequentially reduce CO22,
- 7) you have no independent scientific evidence, though that the Fat Dissolver actually will do this,
- 8) since you don’t know what’s in it, you really don’t know the risks either,
- 9) I will pay you for the Fat Dissolver \$5000 up front and \$100/month for life,
- 10) once I start I am committed forever: I can’t stop,
- 11) it tastes like turpentine, but I just have to toughen up for the greater good,
- 12) there is no guarantee or warrantee of any kind.

“Yes. That’s a reasonable summary. Can I sign you up?”

“OK, where’s the Candid camera?”


Credits


Alica	NYS Citizens
Doctor	State Politicians/ Energy Agencies
RPS	RPS
CO22	CO2
Fat Dissolver	Wind Power
Insurance Companies	Federal and State Governments
Turpentine Taste	Unpalatable Views
Community Salespeople	Wind Turbine Lease Holders
Calorie Conservation	Energy Conservation
Surgery	Nuclear Power
Director	John Droz, jr.

Get A Grip Productions

Copyright: I/XXI/VIII

Wind Power Information Sources

The people on the following pages represent a **sample** cross-section of who (in my opinion) are the better writers regarding the industrial wind power business. [Note: there is no particular order, and all url links should be clickable.]

Wind power is a *technology* issue, and, as such, it is difficult for anybody (esp. scientifically challenged media, politicians, and citizens) to accurately comprehend without spending the time to do a fairly substantial amount of research.

The types of articles on this topic referenced here fall into two general categories:

1) *those written by scientists and technical experts.*

These are often hard for most people to understand because they use many technical terms, and assume that the reader is fluent in the energy field.

Additionally, many authors in this category are not proficient in making their material “readable” (as that is not their primary objective anyway). These articles are for those looking for more indepth technical matter.

2) *those written by lay writers who have extensively studied the topic.*

These articles are much easier to read, even though the reader still has to have a working knowledge of some of the basic terms and concepts of the energy field. To further support their material, this category of report is usually well notated.

Both of these types of authors and articles are listed below, as both are credible sources for information on this complex topic.

As a physicist I can say that in scientific fields the most important aspect of articles and reports is the *accuracy of the content*. The second (very much related) consideration is whether the writer has a financial stake in the issue. My preference below is for independent (and thus more objective) contributors.

What about “peer review”? First of all that hasn’t happened very much in this relatively new field. Secondly, who really are the “peers” is open to debate. Thirdly, even among “peers” there can be *substantial* differences in opinion — witness what is happening regarding various global warming theories.

So how does the average person determine the material’s accuracy? Basically any article ought to pass the sniff test. This is only going to be meaningful if the reader is paying *close attention*. Material in technical fields like wind power are *not* intended for speed reading. They must be *c-a-r-e-f-u-l-l-y* read and digested.

The reader who genuinely wants to learn, simply must give some *serious* thought to what is being presented. If it isn’t entirely clear then they should do supplemental research until they have a good understanding. This is the fundamental problem with wind power advocates: *they have not taken the time to thoroughly study the issue in an objective manner*. The solution is below.

If you have any questions here, please let me know: “aaprjohn@northnet.org.”

Jon Boone:

Mr. Boone lives in Maryland. He has a Ph D in History, and had a 30-year career as an academic administrator with the University of Maryland and is now a painter who receives no income from his work on wind technology.

He produced and directed the documentary “Life Under a Windplant”. He also developed the website Stop Ill Wind <<<http://www.stopillwind.org>>>, which has many wind power related documents. He has been a formal intervener in multiple Maryland Public Service Commission hearings.

His essay “The Aesthetic Dissonance of Industrial Wind Machines” was published in the journal, *Contemporary Aesthetics*. A revised copy of his June, 2006 speech given in Wyoming County, NY “The Wayward Wind”, will be published next year by McGraw Hill, as will his recent scholarly essay, “Less for More: The Rube Goldberg Nature of Industrial Wind Development.”

A lifelong environmentalist, he helped found the North American Bluebird Society and has been a consultant with the Roger Tory Peterson Institute in Jamestown, New York. He seeks informed, effective public policy, and an environmentalism that eschews wishful thinking because it is aware of the unintended adverse consequences flowing from uninformed decisions.

See <<http://www.stopillwind.org/downloads/Maryland_PSC_Testimony.pdf>> for more about Jon’s background.

Sample Articles: “Industrial Wind - A Bill Of Goods” is a classic summary of the illusions of wind power <<<http://tinyurl.com/2oz53f>>>. “Less for More” <<http://www.windcows.com/files/Less_for_More.pdf>> is another excellent piece that has no less than *nine pages* of references.

Robert L. Bradley, jr. PhD:

Robert L. Bradley, Jr. is one of the nation’s leading experts on the history and regulation of energy and related sustainable development issues. He is president of the Institute for Energy Research in Houston; visiting fellow, Institute of Economic Affairs in London; adjunct scholar, Cato Institute; adjunct scholar, Competitive Enterprise Institute; senior fellow (honorary), University of Texas at Austin; member, academic review committee, Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University. For more info about Dr. Bradley see: <<<http://eteam.ncpa.org/about/robert-l-bradley-jr>>>

Sample Article: A fine discussion as to why wind power is neither inexpensive nor green <<<http://www.ncpa.org/studies/renew/renew2e.html>>>.

Eric Rosenbloom:

Eric has a varied background ranging from graduate work in film directing and writing to production positions with publishers Macmillan/McGraw-Hill and Sadlier. He is a freelance science editor and works on a wide range of peer-reviewed journals for the global science publisher Elsevier.

He lives in northeastern Vermont with his wife and son, and is President of National Wind Watch, an organization dedicated to providing objective information about industrial wind power <<<http://www.wind-watch.org/>>>.

Sample Article: The “Problem With Wind” is an insightful and interesting summary about industrial wind power <<<http://tinyurl.com/3bhyt6>>>.

J. A. Halkema:

J. A. Halkema (M.S.E.E.) is a Dutch expert on electricity generation and wind energy. A retired electrical engineer, after graduating from the Technical University in Delft he worked as an Executive Board Member for the international company Brown Boveri Nederland, now Asea Brown Boveri (ABB).

Sample Article: “Wind Energy Facts and Fiction: A Half Truth is a Whole Lie” <<<http://www.countryguardian.net/halkema-windenergyfactfiction.pdf>>>. This 51 page report uses the basic laws of physics to show that wind turbines can never be an acceptable means of generating electricity, except in very limited local situations where reliability is not essential.

Robert Bryce:

Robert lives in Austin, Texas and is managing editor of "Energy Tribune." <<<http://www.energytribune.com/aboutus.cfm>>>. Mr. Bryce has been writing about the energy business for nearly two decades. His articles on energy and other subjects have appeared in numerous publications ranging from *The Atlantic Monthly* to *The Guardian* and *The Nation* to *The American Conservative*.

His first book, *Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron*, was named one of the best non-fiction books of 2002 by *Publishers Weekly*.

Bryce, who is also a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, has appeared on numerous TV and radio programs ranging from the BBC and CNN to PBS and NPR. His third book, *Gusher of Lies: The Dangerous Delusions of Energy Independence*, will be published in early 2008 by PublicAffairs.

Sample Article: “Hot Air — The False Promises of Wind” <<<http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm?aid=509>>>

Tom Tanton:

Tom Tanton is vice president and senior fellow with the Institute for Energy Research (<<http://InstituteforEnergyResearch.org/?page_id=8>>) and principal of T2 and Associates, an energy and technology consulting firm.

Until 2000, Tanton served as the Principal Policy Advisor with the California Energy Commission (CEC) in Sacramento, California. He was also a team member of the California Governor's Office task force on critical infrastructure security, coordinating with national effort lead by White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Sample Article: an excellent discussion about subsidies and favoritism for renewables <<<http://www.perc.org/perc.php?subsection=5&id=586>>>.

Glenn Schleede:

Glenn has a BA degree from Gustavus Adolphus College, and an MA from the University of Minnesota. He is also a graduate of Harvard Business School's Advanced Management Program. He has worked on energy and related matters in government and the private sector for over 30 years.

He was VP of New England Electric System (NEES) and President of its fuels subsidiary, New England Energy. Prior to that Glenn was an Executive Associate Director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (one reason many of his articles are about economics), and Associate Director (Energy and Science) of the White House Domestic Council. Mr. Schleede also held career service positions in the U.S. OMB and the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Schleede now devotes a large share of his time to self-financed analysis and writing about (a) government policies and programs that are detrimental to consumers and taxpayers and (b) government or private sector activities that are presented to the media, public and government officials in a misleading way.

Sample Articles: A Critical Evaluation on NYSERDA's Plans (2007)
<<<http://tinyurl.com/37vkkz>>>; "Wind Energy Economics in the State of NY"
<<<http://tinyurl.com/28m8p2>>>.

J. Terry Rogers, PhD:

"JT" has several degrees (PhD, FCAE, F.C.S.M.E., P.Eng.), and is a nuclear engineer, energy analyst, adjunct Research Professor, and Professor Emeritus (Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering) at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. He is also currently the Chairman of the Research and Development Advisory Panel to Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd Board of Directors.

Sample Article: An analysis of various options to replace coal fired plants
<<http://www.cns-snc.ca/media/CNS_Position_Papers/Ontario_coal.pdf>>.

Sterling Burnett, PhD:

H. Sterling Burnett is the Senior Policy Analyst with the National Center for Policy Analysis (<<<http://www.ncpa.org/abo/>>>), a nonpartisan, non-profit research and education institute in Dallas, Texas. See <<<http://www.ncpa.org/abo/staff/sburnett.html>>> for his full resume.

Sample Articles: “More Turbulence for Wind Energy” (11/07)
<<<http://tinyurl.com/2cz64r>>>; “Wind Power Red, not Green”
<<<http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba/ba467/>>>.

Jesse Ausubel:

Jesse is Director of the Program for the Human Environment, and is a Senior Research Associate at The Rockefeller University in New York City. His interests include environmental science and technology, industrial evolution, and the nature of the scientific enterprise. The main themes of the Rockefeller research program are industrial ecology and the long-term interactions of technology and the environment. For the remainder of Jesse’s *extensive* resume see: <<<http://phe.rockefeller.edu/jesse/>>>.

Sample Articles (all PDFs): “Nuclear and Renewable Heresies”
<<<http://phe.rockefeller.edu/docs/HeresiesFinal.pdf>>>; “Where is Energy Going” <<<http://phe.rockefeller.edu/IndustrialPhysicistWhere/where.pdf>>>; “Future Environment of the Energy Business”, with an interesting comparison and graph about the amount of land needed for wind power vs nuclear <<<http://phe.rockefeller.edu/docs/appeaausubel12april.pdf>>>.

Tom Hewson:

Tom has a Civil Engineering degree from Princeton University, and is a principal with Energy Ventures Analysis, Inc. He is responsible for power industry market studies. He provides regular power industry forecasts of future electricity demand growth, generation mix, environmental compliance and individual client studies. Tom has completed numerous studies examining the effect of future environmental regulation and utility deregulation on fuel prices, supplier capacity, generation/environmental technology choice, wholesale electric prices and emission allowance values. He provides market assessments for new fuel, generation and pollution control technologies. For the rest of Mr. Hewson’s lengthy resume, see: <<http://www.evainc.com/th_res.htm>>.

Sample Article: A brief review on how property values can be affected by wind projects <<<http://tinyurl.com/ytq9r7>>>.

David White:

David White, (BSc, C Eng, F I Chem E) is an energy consultant, and has held a range of senior management posts with Exxon over a 30 year period. He took early retirement in 1987, and created an energy consultancy practice. He has focused on technologies that offer solutions to emission problems from a range of fossil fuels and wastes by the application of energy conversion technologies.

He chaired the Institution of Chemical Engineers Gasification Conference Steering Committee. He also sits on the IChemE Energy Technology Subject Group Committee and represents IChemE on a number of Inter-Institutional Committees and the Parliamentary Group for Energy Studies. He also drafts many of the Institution's responses to energy related issues.

Sample Articles: two PDFs - an analysis of CO2 savings from wind power <<<http://www.ref.org.uk/images/pdfs/Whiteco2.pdf>>>; “Danish Wind — Too Good To Be True” <<<http://www.aweo.org/White-DenmarkTooGood.pdf>>>.

Thomas R. Casten:

Mr. Casten is Chairman of Recycled Energy Development, and has spent 30 years developing decentralized energy recycling projects. He was founding president and CEO of Trigen Energy Corporation, a New York Stock Exchange corporation and its predecessors from 1977 through 2000. He served until 2006 as founding chair & CEO of Primary Energy Ventures LLC, an Oak Brook, Illinois-based firm with a Toronto Stock Exchange traded subsidiary, Primary Energy Recycling Corp. For more about his background see <<http://www.recycled-energy.com/who_it_is.html>>.

Sample Article: Waste Heat to Power (2007) <<<http://tinyurl.com/389k3o>>>. This presentation [PDF] is not directly about wind power, but it is *significant* in that it is telling us that there **are legitimate ways** that we can reduce CO2 emissions and help with Global Warming.

Ⓢ Our state and federal governments should be doing more of what he says (decentralization & energy recovery) instead of wasting money on wind power.

Selected Additions

Note: this document is intended to be *selected*, representative authors and articles. It is **not** comprehensive, as any such listing would be massive. Below are some additional superb sources for accurate wind power information. Please see <<<http://windaction.org>>> and <<<http://wind-watch.org>>> for many more.

Robert J. Michaels PhD (a superior assessment of the value and implications of national and state RPS's): <<<http://tinyurl.com/5zxvs2>>>.

Max Shulz (a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute's Center for Energy Policy and the Environment. He has written many energy articles, e.g.): “Energy and Environmental Myths and Facts” <<<http://tinyurl.com/6pn5g9>>>, and “NY Unplugged” <<http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/sr_06-08.pdf>>.

Nina Pierpont, MD, PhD (specializes in health effects from living near industrial wind developments): <<<http://www.ninapierpont.com/?s=wind>>>.

Vic Mason, PhD (a Danish scientist who has written several exposes about the problems with wind power in Denmark): <<<http://tinyurl.com/323b9n>>>.

Daren Baskt, J.D., LL.M (legal and regulatory policy analyst for Locke): “A Wind Power Primer” (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/5c4wcj>>>.

Elliott Gue MS is editor of *The Energy Letter* (<<<http://tinyurl.com/336npv>>>), and has written several analytical articles about wind power, e.g. <<<http://tinyurl.com/33la7f>>> and <<<http://tinyurl.com/2omsn8>>>.

Paul Adamthwaite, PhD (a Canadian who has written a superior overview of wind power): <<http://www.aandc.org/research/wind_pec_present.html>>.

Rick Bolton (physicist and engineer has done fine work, particularly on noise analysis): <<<http://tinyurl.com/32g3z9>>>. See also his excellent general wind power comments at a DEIS hearing <<<http://tinyurl.com/2nwq3t>>>.

Bernard Viau (a Canadian environmentalist who has a real skill for writing): “Money Blowing in the Wind” <<<http://www.cmaq.net/en/node/28374>>>, “Wind Energy: Beware, Turbulence Ahead” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2benuj>>>.

Terry Matilsky, PhD (good technical assessments, e.g. this comprehensive noise and ice throw analyses): <<<http://tinyurl.com/2mtah3>>>.

Brad Jones (an excellent PP presentation): <<<http://tinyurl.com/2nezag>>>.

Leo M. Schwartz (The Virginia Land Rights Coalition): “Wind - Facts or Blowing Hot Air?” <<<http://www.sovereignty.net/p/clim/wind-leo.htm>>>. “Wind power is supported by certain 'environmental' activists, the government and the wind industry, to establish industrial wind-generated electricity. It is misconceived for two simple reasons: they believe wind power is exempt from immutable economic principles, and the laws of science.”

Eleanor Tillinghast (president of Green Berkshires: these sample articles have numerous references) “Tilting at Windmills” <<<http://tinyurl.com/ypx6w3>>>, “Why Energy Conservation Trumps Windmills” <<<http://tinyurl.com/2oby8l>>>.

Jack Sullivan, MD (a superb letter as to why he voted against wind power): <<[http://www.credny.org/JackSullivan7-22-06\[1\].htm](http://www.credny.org/JackSullivan7-22-06[1].htm)>>.

Groups of experts weighing in:

There are more wind turbines in Germany than in any other country. These prominent German scientists signed this protest against wind power: <<http://www.savethevale.org.uk/darmstadt_manifesto.html>>.

These 200+ American economists (including a *Nobel Laureate*) signed this protest against the federal and state subsidies wind power is getting <<http://www.ntu.org/main/letters_detail.php?letter_id=538>>.

Model Wind Ordinance:

If your community simply must have some type of Wind Ordinance, then they should copy the regulations of Trempealeau County, Wisconsin.

In early 2007 their county legislators established a 20 person Wind Advisory Committee. Those people were assigned the mission of creating a county ordinance that focused solely on the *health and safety of county residents*.

The Committee spent many months researching this, and closely studied numerous ordinances throughout the world. Their proposal was accepted by their county commissioners and passed into law in December of 2007. Their carefully crafted ordinance can be found at <<<http://tinyurl.com/36mo3y>>>.

Another superb analysis was done by a similar independent committee in the town of Bethany, NY, also in 2007 (PDF) <<<http://tinyurl.com/63pdzj>>>.

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● **SUMMARY** ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

This document is a total waste. All of the studies, reports and articles I've cited here are a waste. It's criminal that these talented people have had to spend their valuable time in writing, as a public service, about what should be a non-issue. Essentially they have taken time out of their lives to disprove the unproven.

Jon Boone, a word craftsman, accurately sums up the situation like this:

*"I've concluded that industrial wind energy in the United States exemplifies American business at its worst: promising to **save the environment** while **wreaking havoc** on it.*

*"Spawned, then supported, by government welfare measures at **considerable** public expense, it produces **no meaningful product** or service yet provides **enormous profit** to a few wealthy investors, primarily multinational energy companies in search of increased bottom lines.*

*"It's an **environmental plunderer**, using a few truths, many half-truths, and the politics of wishful thinking to frame a house of lies. **It's all a bill of goods.**"*