

***We are told...* the solution to climate change will include
WIND and SOLAR GENERATION FOR THE GRID**

But...

What if... wind, solar, and other intermittent renewables simply won't work to supply the grid?

What if... there is really no hope of practical, affordable intermittent-to-continuous grid-scale batteries being invented in time?

What if... wind and solar, plus their inefficient gas-fuelled backup, create more CO2 than gas generation alone?

What if... fiction, propaganda and obfuscation have been spread by vested interests (including fossil fuel industries)?

What if... we, NGOs, the media, and academic institutions have gone along with the grid renewables fantasy and never bothered to calculate or research the reality?

What if... we have been led down a path which has wasted resources, distracted us from a viable energy solution, and thrown away the time needed to survive climate change until it is all but too late?

Wouldn't that be strange?

Wouldn't that be awful?

Could such a thing be true?

Shouldn't someone check?



Tim Rickman, November 2019. (I am Tim Rman on facebook.)

WIND AND SOLAR PROBLEMS (the complicated explanation):

Wind and solar power generation seem loved by almost everyone, including the fossil fuel industries. The whole supposed point of intermittent renewables like wind and solar is to reduce the warming emissions of greenhouse gases. However, when supplying the grid, intermittent power must either be stored (which is not practical, and clearly will not soon become so) or else be always supported by reliable power sources, which are normally gas. This results in the already significant warming emissions from intermittent sources being increased several times over, because “open cycle” gas turbines flexible enough for this role are far less efficient than “closed cycle” gas turbines designed for continuous generation. The need to rapidly and frequently change the turbines' output to compensate for changes in power coming from intermittent generators reduces efficiency further, as does the need to keep gas plant turning or just ready for immediate use. In addition, such duplication of generation plant requires extra manufacture and activity, with its own emissions. Although not easy to calculate exactly, the resultant total warming emissions are clearly far too high to be acceptable for a net-zero-carbon grid supply, and may even be higher than the emissions which would have been produced by gas generation alone. Support for intermittent generation could, in theory, be provided with very low emissions by nuclear power. However, in practice nuclear generation is run continuously at full power (partly because reducing output power saves no fuel) so doing this would simply render the renewable generators unnecessary, with electricity equal to their output being surplus (and possibly discarded). The decision to build intermittent renewables also has long-term consequences. It discourages investment in nuclear power, because investors know that nuclear generators may in future be forced to discard power without any payment whenever there is sun shining or wind blowing. Future governments, rather than buy nuclear plants which will supply the whole power requirement at very low emissions for anything up to a century and thereby render the existing expensive plant pointless, are likely to feel they already have half a power supply for their grid which they are reluctant to abandon, and consequently they may be tempted to add high-emissions gas generation instead. For all these reasons, the fossil fuel industries seem keen to promote intermittent renewables. Much of the misleading pro-renewables and anti-nuclear publicity may come either directly from fossil fuel interests or from institutions receiving fossil fuel money. There are very few impartial and well-informed public sources of information about grid generation, and the media virtually never mentions any of the issues mentioned above.