

ZERO- CARBONS:

THE OPTIONS

We do not oppose green energy, contrary to popular belief, but would argue instead that each and every energy type must be looked at and assessed on an individual basis before so blindly steaming ahead with any production. Had this had been done from the beginning I believe the utter mess we have today would never have occurred. They could easily have built prototypes of each one, then gone through all of the pitfalls with honesty and integrity, and not with the deceptions and cover-ups that have become all too apparent. The green-lobbyists however, green with mould more like, were so keen to get their agendas out there by hook or by crook that this was simply never going to happen.

Given below, and long overdue in my view, is a complete list of zero-carbon energy sources, those with genuine, ecologically safe credentials are marked with an asterisk; increasing numbers of them depending on safety and viability. I have taken on board what many have said and have written what I believe to be a fair enough report.

1 Wind Power: An absolutely hideous concept for all kinds of reasons with endless possibilities of disaster. Most people it seems are still blissfully unaware as to the true detrimental effects wind-farms are having on the ecology. The feelings are that if they were just 'tucked out of the way somewhere away from people,' then everything is fine. And these are the thoughts of those who actually care about the local wildlife what's more. There seems to be no correlation, other than some passing thoughts, that wind-farms are any threat at all. But the real fact is, there is a fatal attraction of all things flying, from the tiniest of insects to largest of birds.

Problems arise when a bird flies into the vicinity of a wind-farm, which it will do sometime in its life, there are now so many of them everywhere you look. They become transfixed, mesmerised if you like, by the blades going round and round and round and round. They then fly towards these blades, seeing them as an object of play, completely unaware of the dangers ahead. The insect swarms are of course a further draw for hirundines and bats, which are known to move great distances between one site to the next looking for good meals. It must be remembered too that this is the first time in the entire history of the planet species have had to negotiate anything like this. Species simply didn't evolve, strange as it may seem, with wind-farms all over the place. And don't think those off-shore ones are any safer because they're not.

There are research papers on this very problem. They make quite heavy reading but they're available to anyone who wants them. There are also some thoughts on the matter suggesting that colour might be a factor, but I don't really go along with the idea, whatever the colour they're hardly likely to be less visible to birds. That said of course, the worst possible colour for attracting insects and therefore hirundines and bats would be bright yellow. This would attract more insects than anything else.

Please view any one of the links below and feel free to forward them on to anyone who might need convincing. To do this, the easiest way is to highlight, copy and paste them onto wordpad and then you can click on each one.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8NAAzBArYdw>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RcTjdY1aN4>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRSaVD8VAbl>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtgBWNKwBkE>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6x1hT5SONUg>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CEersoJLtRw>
<http://www.iberica2000.org/Es/Articulo.asp?Id=2968>
<http://www.epaw.org/multimedia.php?article=b2>
<http://www.epaw.org/multimedia.php?lang=es&article=b6>
<http://www.iberica2000.org/Es/Articulo.asp?Id=3583>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dpYKcTWBzvQ>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRqu4WiLQfk>
<http://www.eastcountymagazine.org/node/12544>
<http://savetheeagles.wordpress.com/birdkill-pictures/>
http://www2.ekol.slu.se/Personliga_filer/Ahlen/JmammBatsatSeaDec09.pdf
http://peer.ccsd.cnrs.fr/docs/00/62/51/48/PDF/PEER_stage2_10.1007%252Fs10344-010-0432-7.pdf
<http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/620-5571-2.pdf>
<http://www.slu.se/PageFiles/8390/artiklar/BirdsWindPowerVF2010.pdf>
<http://publikationer.slu.se/Filer/08WindBatFinalReport.pdf>
<http://wcfm.org/2013/07/01/tip-of-the-iceberg/>
<http://savetheeaglesinternational.org/multimedia/>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtgBWNKwBkE&NR=1>
<http://www.iberica2000.org/Es/Articulo.asp?Id=3071>
<http://science.time.com/2013/09/11/study-wind-farms-killed-67-eagles-in-5-years/>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gzrsopSplV4>
<http://www.nationalreview.com/node/365800/print>
<http://www.nationalreview.com/nro-energy/365800/green-energy-kills-eagles-robert-bryce/page/0/1>
<http://bit.ly/lvvF8u>

A concept I had is one where you would have a hoop going around the circumference of the turbine blades from which there would be strands attached at around 2-3 meters apart; forming a mesh that would keep birds and bats from flying underneath the blades. The idea is to effectively create a rotating wheel rather than having those three murderous, clonking great prongs we have exposed with the present design. FoE., Greenpeace, WWF. and the RSPB.

showed no interest at all despite the fact that it would certainly work; and the only response we did get cited the expense and inconvenience it would cause. What I would say is, if this can save the lives of thousands of threatened species each year then it will all be worth it.

Really of course, even with the bird-deaths' issue resolved, and it's an unproven concept assuming it even became accepted in any case, the appalling ruination of moorlands and islands means that it is still a wholly unacceptable way in which to produce our green-energy. I would suggest therefore that we look at other ways of going about it.

2*** Tidal Power: I actually quite like this idea and there's no need for barrages and all of the problems they would inflict; disruptions to Eel, Salmon and Trout migration routes, and the loss of valuable tidal-mud up river etc. Just individual units positioned on the estuary beds. Totally unlike wind, water is very resistant and the velocity of tidal flows on any given estuary system is also very predictable, which means both much shorter blades (with less rotation speed at the tips), and each unit within its site can be geared down for a faster turbine speed, correspondingly decreasing the blade speeds still further. Also, and again unlike wind, they would be sitting in their own coolant, wind machines commonly catch fire but that could never happen with tidal. Further more they could have, if required, internationally recognised mandatory grills fitted to all machines in order to guard against the death and injury of larger fish, birds and mammals; although if the blade-speed problem were to be over-come this should become a lot less of an issue anyway. Mainly out of sight and the dangers to marine-life very much reduced, I think this could well be a perfect solution to our energy needs, provided that is if these blade-speed requirements are met. There would need to be very stringent regulations in place however, as we've seen with both nuclear and wind, the industry has an appalling track-record when it comes to any sort of safety.

It's worth mentioning I think that there has been a good deal of opposition in the past regarding infra-structure that would naturally go hand in hand with any kind of energy development, as well as power sources and lines where terrorists could tap into was also mentioned. But really no matter what kind of power you may be talking about, nuclear, coal or whatever, these are things that are always going to occur in any case. You're obviously not going to want them in places of natural beauty or where a particular species might be threatened, but there again that same argument stands no matter the power type. Be on guard by all means, but I don't think we should be overly knit-picking either. I would even argue, if I dare, that not all wind is bad. The old sailing ships and the Seventeenth Century wind-mills were nothing like what we have today.

3* Wave Power: These are objects that bob up and down on waves like corks. They don't actually kill wildlife but can look unsightly and are also prone to heavy storm damage. Whale migration routes and areas where dolphins congregate should obviously be avoided.

4*** The Tapping of Salt Water as a Green Energy Source: Statkraft, Norway's national energy producer, is behind the project. After 10 years of research and \$20 million USD invested, they will be looking to this experimental plant to show that this technology is commercially viable. Not being on great terms with Statkraft, they've never got back to me to discuss this further.

As good an energy source as this might prove to be, I'd have serious doubts they'd come clean with any problems.

5 Hydro Power-plants: Please view any one of the following links, and feel free to forward them on to anyone you feel might need convincing. Highlight, copy and paste these too onto wordpad.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7cKFdsS7IVw>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PPxafs6DeZM>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0039356>

6 Hydro Dams: Generally bad news. Aswan Dam in Egypt, swallowing up ancient ruins; thousands of hectares of rainforest now submerged in Amazonia; disruption to fisheries; lowering of downriver water-levels; the list goes on and on.

7* Water Mills: As long as they're sited away from sensitive areas, there's probably no problem. Perhaps more research is needed on this one.

8 Nuclear Power? No Thanks. Atomkraft? Nein Danke. Atomkraaft? Nee Merci. Etc.

9** Solar Panels: They don't actually kill wildlife, they tend to look unsightly on rooftops and can take up huge areas of desert habitat. We don't oppose them per se.

10 Concentrated Solar Power: A system that uses mirror-lenses to concentrate a high density of sunlight onto a small area on a central column for the purpose of heating water. Actually a lot less land-hungry than conventional solar. If there was ever any way of making these places a whole lot safer, like say with a grid to keep birds out of the epicentre area, we might be willing to take a second look. Tall buildings act as a magnet for birds seeing them as objects to fly around or use as a perch. Please see images below.



Wings and tail of a Swallow badly singed and rendered flightless.

11** Biofuel: I did have this idea of growing Oil Palm in Central Western Africa where this palm grows in its native homeland. The idea was create some natural habitat, using native trees and moving away from the manicured, regimented rows of monocultures, which are so commonly associated with the standard plantations of S.E. Asia (see 'Plant Forests and Make a Fortune' for further details). If it was going to be done, I think it would need to be an organic market, perhaps serving the local comm-unities at first and then expanding on from there.

12*** Fuel Efficiency: Simply turning off of unneeded office and street lights, using low-energy appliances and fittings etc., excluding mercury light bulbs. ie. just not wasting it in the first place.

We will continue to update this paper as and when more information comes to light. Please do let me know what you think, many of the best ideas came from members writing in. If anyone has anything to at all to add then please do drop me a line. We need positive ideas and no knit-picking over trivialities.

In the meantime we have the might of the energy industry itself as well as all of those conservationists like WWF., RSPB., FoE. and Greenpeace etc. Those who are all calling for more and more and yet more wind-farms together with all the murderous consequences and increasing threats they will inevitably bring.

Green-energy, in its truest regards, is what's needed. There's enough opposition out there so let's do everything we can to steer things in a better direction.

GREEN ENERGY:

If the industry were to put the good of the planet ahead of personal ambition, things could be much improved.