

*"When government robs Peter to pay Paul, it can always depend on the support of Paul"*

*- George Bernard Shaw*

## Introduction

The arguments for wind power seem straightforward and compelling. Wind power would reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Wind power is clean and would allow shutting down dirty fossil fuel fired power plants. Wind power would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Wind power is free. Investment in wind power quickly pays for itself. These arguments sound all too powerful and all make sense. Or do they?

First, there is the notion that somehow wind power will reduce our dependency on foreign oil. This hope is hinged on the prospect that wind power will somehow replace fossil derived electric power. The problem with this theory is that wind is so unpredictable that anywhere from 80% to 100% of whatever new wind power generation is brought on line, must still be backed up with standard generation facilities that can be counted on for their reliable power. In the event there are not enough existing standard generation facilities in place, new ones would have to be added. Otherwise, the level of reliability of power availability would be jeopardized. Thus, we would be paying for two power generation facilities – the good, old-fashioned, dependable, dispatchable power plants, and the new, unpredictable, undispachable wind power plants that may or may not operate, depending on how much wind is blowing.

Second, clean wind energy will be able to replace or retire dirty power plants. This too is not borne out by experience. Since the dirty reliable power must remain on standby to backup the new unpredictable wind power, there is virtually no reduction in the use of dirty power plants or the dirty fuel they burn. In fact, when fossil-fired power plants have to be backed off to permit wind power as the primary generation mode, fossil plants burn their fuel less efficiently. In addition, when fossil plants must cycle wildly in response to erratic wind powered electric generation, they produce even more emissions, because non-steady-state operation is inherently less efficient, producing more emissions than steady-state operation.

Third, there is the prospect that wind power would reduce the effects of global warming by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This prospect falls apart when you look at the facts. Nature produces more than 29 times more CO<sub>2</sub> than does mankind. Water vapor

By Charles S. Opalek, PE

produces more than 26 times more of a greenhouse gas effect (GGE) than does CO<sub>2</sub>. (Methane, nitrous oxide and CFCs account for less than half of the GGE of CO<sub>2</sub>). Fossil fuel burning accounts for 40.08% of all electrical generating power. Thus, if 20% of our electrical power was replaced with wind power, the reduction in greenhouse gases would be a miniscule 0.00948%.

Fourth, wind energy is free. Well, not exactly. Wind turbines are always consuming electrical power to keep their own auxiliary systems functioning, whether the wind is blowing, or not. All the publicity regarding wind power concentrates on the power it produces, if it is producing any at all. Few people are aware that wind turbines consume electricity, whether they are operating, or not.

Fifth, is the claim that wind power pays for itself. If this were the case, then why do they require subsidies to be brought to market? The only reason these things get built is upfront tax benefits for the developers. After these benefits are exhausted, developers have no incentive to hold onto these projects, and cannot wait to unload them.

All the above claims appear genuine. But, there is a lot more going on here than meets the eye. Behind all these claims are the real reasons why wind power is being so heavily promoted.

- 1) Massive tax breaks that can be taken advantage by large corporations to reduce – and in some cases totally eliminate - their tax burden.
- 2) Lucrative commissions made by floating bond issues and finance creation for wind power projects.
- 3) Real estate deals made by land transfers required to site wind power projects.
- 4) Public Relations.
- 5) And of course, finally, wherever there is a lot of money, there is power and control.

The players include:

- a) zealots like Al Gore
- b) tycoons like T. Boone Pickens
- c) some of the largest and well known corporations like Enron, Florida Power and Light, and General Electric
- d) government agencies like DOE and NREL.
- e) state and local regulators and commissions.
- f) banking and brokerage firms like JP Morgan and Goldman Sachs.
- g) legal organizations like the American Bar Association and law firms
- h) the legacy media of newspapers, magazines and network television
- i) lobbyists
- j) national, state and local politicians including senators, representatives, governors, mayors, councilmen, and town fathers.

Alas, sorry to say, the players exclude taxpayers and electric bill payers.

The players can be categorized into peer groups as follows.

By Charles S. Opalek, PE

- 1) Big money climate change scientists. People on both sides of the argument on global warming accuse the other of being manipulated or controlled by money. The global warming believers accuse the deniers of being funded by Big Oil, etc. Money is coming in to both sides of the issue. But how much to each side? By my estimates I would say the deniers or antagonists are annually getting dozens of millions; the believers or protagonists BILLIONS of dollars. The disparity is astonishing, probably about 1,000 times as much money goes to funding how man causes climate change than to why nature is responsible for all the climate change being documented. And why not? Crises sell. Crises means even more research has to be funded. With the myriad government stimulus plans set in place in 2009, there are now TENS OF BILLIONS of dollars being made available for climate research in the USA. Want to guess what percentage will be allocated to find out how much nature causes global warming?
- 2) Public education and academia. In 1870, British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli said "It has been discovered that the best way to insure implicit obedience is to commence tyranny in the nursery". And continuing in that tradition of public education, I am sure that for every school that has shown the movie An Inconvenient Truth to its students, no attempt whatsoever was made to present the opposing point of view. Where AIT was not shown, I can say without fear of contradiction that the vast majority of the teachers impart to their students the impression that man is totally responsible for global warming. Thus, our children are not being educated on the issue of global warming, they are being indoctrinated.
- 3) Corporations. General Electric is the world's second largest producer of wind turbines. Enron, though defunct, pioneered the carbon trade schemes of today. Florida Power & Light, though a utility company, reaps enormous tax benefits from wind. There are a lot of corporations out there that would probably like to make money in an honest fashion. But, all corporations have no other choice but to include in their business model any additional profit that can be made off the general public offered under the guise of alternative energy. I once was asked to provide "expert witness testimony" in a court against another engineer. After that episode, I came home that night and took two showers. I never felt so dirty before. Because of this unpleasant experience, I never accepted any other offers to provide expert witness testimony again. I suspect some corporations may feel the same way about profiting from the alternative energy market.
- 4) Banks and brokerage houses. Banks like J. P. Morgan and brokerage houses like Goldman Sachs stand to make a fortune funding and underwriting wind power facilities. The commissions these organizations make for their part in bringing financing for wind power to market is, at a minimum, enormous. And with it, the huge bonuses for big shot executives cannot be far behind.

By Charles S. Opalek, PE

- 5) Government. H. L. Mencken said “the whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed – and hence clamorous to be led to safety - by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary”. So what incentive is there for politicians not to pile onto this gravy train? With the exception of Steve Lonegan who ran for Governor of New Jersey and lost, I have not heard one politician call wind power or other alternative energies for what they truly are – a waste of taxpayer money.
- 6) The media - or to be more precise - the ‘legacy’ media. This is the media we grew up with; TV, newspapers and magazines. The legacy media are the “gatekeepers”. They decide which guests and what issues appear on TV, what current events are covered in the newspapers, and what stories would be told in the magazines. Thomas Jefferson said: “Advertisements contain the only truths to be relied on in the newspaper.” I get all my news from reputable news outlets on the Internet. There, the transcript can be read in total peace and quiet. I have given up watching the evening news, because I cannot stand why every single word needs to be nuanced, accentuated and/or punctuated. Every story, no matter how inane and unimportant is transformed into a roaring torrent of words, as if it were the most important story ever told. The pinnacle came while I watched a weather forecast, where meteorologists were waiting impatiently for the season’s first snow fall. They were all out in the streets adorned in their parkas with their measuring sticks in hand, screaming above the roar of nearby diesel-powered snow plows, salivating at the prospect of pouncing upon the first snow flake that would appear. My nerves were getting jangled over nothing. Now, I watch the Weather Channel with the sound muted.
- 7) Environmentalists. Edwin X. Berry PhD is a climate physicist. Decades ago, he was a member of the Sierra Club. Back then the Sierra Club consisted solely of individuals who truly cared about the environment. But, things changed. He eventually quit, because the Sierra Club, like most environmental organizations, became less environmental and more anti-capitalist, or to be blunt, just anti-American. Today, virtually all Sierra Club members are elitists, leftists, anti-industrialists, socialists, or Communists. Dr. Berry has likened the structure of these environmental groups to that of watermelons – they are ‘green’ on the outside, ‘red’ on the inside.
- 8) The ‘green’ and ‘sustainability’ movements. I have never seen a bigger bunch of pompous, self-absorbed, bureaucratic, paperwork intensive individuals than those of the green and sustainability movements. Their arrogance and condescension is repulsive. To listen to them you come away concluding that they, and only they, are the ones who can save the planet from mankind itself. All they have is a cure - for which there is no disease.
- 9) The legal profession. Where there’s money, lawyers cannot be far behind. A web search using “wind energy law firm” (without quotes) got 482,000 hits. This is the

By Charles S. Opalek, PE

mother lode for lawyers. The first mother lode for lawyers was asbestos, then came cigarettes. Now its wind power.

10) The United Nations. This organization consists of a hand-full (G5 to G7) to a couple dozen (G12 to G20) fairly well-off nations and about 170 remaining countries. This latter majority of countries consists of monarchies, kingdoms, dictatorships, autocracies, theocracies, and kleptocracies. With rare exception their political structure is socialist and always have their hands out extended to the richer countries. Nowhere was this more evident than the 2009 Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen. This meeting should have been called the 2009 Copenhagen Wealth Redistribution Conference, because that is what it was. A bunch of whining, less affluent countries groveling for money from their more affluent peers. The best thing that could happen to the United States is for the UN to leave New York City, return all the diplomat reserved parking spaces to ordinary citizens, and convert the UN buildings into condominiums and a civic center.

From within all the above groups are individuals which gravitate or collect in rather distinct layers. They are the ones whose names would likely be unfamiliar to almost everyone, or are the usual suspects always seen on TV or mentioned in the newspapers, or are the rank and file of various organizations. There are six levels in order of their importance:

- i) The rarely seen power brokers that really dictate the game and really run the global warming show. Like Maurice Strong or Susan Solomon at the UN, or media moguls like Sumner Redstone of Viacom or Jeffrey Bewkes of Time Warner, who set the agenda for their underlings.
- ii) The spokespeople or mouthpieces like Al Gore, scientists like James Hansen, or Hollywood types like Ed Begley and Danny Glover.
- iii) The Inner Circle of influential scientists who author and "peer review" each others papers and conduct research, like Gavin Schmidt, Phil Jones, Michael Mann, or Keith Briffa.
- iv) The 'gatekeepers' or editors, moderators, reporters, or anchors who decide what issues and people will be showcased in their venue.
- v) The outer circle of worker bees associated with government, corporations, academia, or research.
- vi) The drones, outsiders, followers, and the rest of us.

The fall of the Berlin Wall did not signal the end of Communism in Russia. It was the signal that the flood gates of Communism had opened up and were about to infect the world. This flood provided a new crop of Communists to enter academia, media, environmental groups, government, industry, banking, and a plethora of other institutions around the world. Communism didn't die with the fall of the Berlin Wall. It just found new homes in which to incubate.

By Charles S. Opalek, PE

What makes this whole obscene plan of environmentalism, global warming, and alternative energy work is guilt. If people can be convinced they are guilty of something, they are apt to be more willing to give up some of their money as payment for their alleged wrongdoings. Or, just like the religious indulgences of the past, if monetary offerings were made then the sinning could continue.

From the list of players above come the teams for whole new cottage industries, including the industry of wind power. This industry was not born of any need of the marketplace. This industry has been legislated into existence for the good of a chosen few. This is big money. This is Big Wind.

This team of players is the salacious syndicate driving the otherwise altruistic aim of providing a renewable source of electric power that supposedly will break our dependence on foreign oil, lower CO2 emissions, and create 'green jobs'.

**A more accurate description of this salacious syndicate would be a wind power fraud.**