

To: Kevin.Rudd.MP@aph.gov.au
From: george blahusiak <georgebl@iprimus.com.au>
Subject: Re: Solar energy, nuclear energy, and global warming
Cc:
Bcc:
Attached:

Mr Kevin Rudd
Member for Griffith

Dear Mr Rudd

I would like to thank the people who responded to my e-mail on solar energy. Their input allows me to bring certain matters before you that I had omitted in the interests of economy.

First, I would not for a minute suggest that solar energy should be the sole source of energy. What I did was to show that it cannot supply the world's energy needs. This contrasts with the great number of 'greenies' who state quite categorically that there is enough energy falling on the Earth in one day to provide all of our energy needs but apparently without considering the environmental impact of their claims let alone the engineering problems.

With respect to the remainder of those responses, anyone can say that tidal power, or wind, or biomass, or any combination of all of these can help. What I want to see is a solution. What I want to see some facts and figures. Show me the data and if it is good I will support that case. If people bringing this argument before you can't do it, that is, show precisely how their case will solve our problems, tell them to get out of the road and let someone else have a go. Right now all I see from the proponents of renewable energy is what appears to be wishful thinking. That isn't good enough.

Since the point was raised, however, it is my understanding that Western Power (WA) has done a study of renewable energy and found it wanting. The problem is that renewable energy is, to a large degree, intermittent, and has no real density to provide base load power.

One must then consider the argument being put forward by the Minister and the head of Western Power, that we should average our demand on the system so we don't have all of that infrastructure lying around idle at great cost to the community. I have already estimated that cost to be about \$200 million p.a.. But what will renewable energy do? It will lead to a situation where even more of that infrastructure is lying around even more idle at an even greater cost to the community.

There was a suggestion that computers should use LCD screens instead of CRT screens? How much energy will this really save?

Let's estimate it shall we?

A CRT uses nominally 60-80 watts. On a typical day that's less than 1 kw-hr. Averaged out

over the number of CRT screens in use in WA and that works out to be less than 0.25 Kw-hr per day, i.e., less than 0.1 percent of total energy consumption.

What about solar water heaters? The figures tell the same story again. Water heaters consume approximately 1/3 of domestic energy, say 2 kw-hrs per day per person. That works out to be less than 1 percent of total energy use.

A friend of mine calculated that simply by getting rid of all those circuit monitors in the various electronic devices around our houses we could save something like 53 Mw per year, but that also is essentially nothing compared to the size of the problem.

The comments regarding improving the efficiency of transport are valid. I believe I mentioned transport in my essay regarding Kim Beazley's comments on renewable energy. I think 'overnight' is a bit of an exaggeration though, but I can forgive that one. In fact it would take about 10 years before most of the cars on the road would age to the point that they would be replaced with a mandated fuel efficient car. BTW, it is my understanding that in Japan cars are not allowed on the road if they are more than 3 years old.

John Howard previously put \$1.5 billion on the table, and has now put an additional \$10 billion on the table to deal with global warming (I refuse to use the euphemism 'climate change'). The direction of spending, however, appears to be toward accommodating ourselves to global warming instead of addressing the causes of the problem. The money would be far better spent by putting it into a factory to build Prius cars, or equivalent, or better public transport.

I have received a complaint about fuel guzzlers. Each of you is in Parliament. Has any legislature passed mandated fuel efficiency and emission standards for cars? If not, why not?

Someone said that we don't have to wait until 2050 to achieve savings. I agree. Who is taking any positive steps to really deal with the problem, besides myself, instead of just talking about it.

Someone said that my comments have merit but miss the point in the conversations about a clean energy future.

And precisely what is that point?

There are 7 or 8 different solutions to the global warming problem in the public domain, if not more. Some of them are more economical than others, some are less economical, some of them are more profitable than others, some are less profitable, some of them are easy to implement, some are hard to implement. Some, carbon sequestration for example, are a complete waste of time, merely putting the problem off for future generations to deal with. Global warming has become popular science, and a way to make money, without the slightest thought to the long term consequences.

No solution to the global warming problem will work if countries refuse to recognize the nature and extent of the problem, or of denying that a problem exists, saying, "Oh it's just another drought." as I heard on the radio on Sunday.

No solution will work if people engage in wishful thinking, or of tinkering at the edges, or acting in their own self interest, or of using solutions for political ends, as the demand of John Howard and George Bush appears to be, to limit the development of China and other

developing nations by forcing them to accept carbon limits which we ourselves won't accept.

With respect,

George Blahusiak

+++++

At 03:35 PM 22/01/2007, you wrote:

George,

Solar does have an important role to play in reducing GHG emission. No one is suggesting that solar alone should replace our full energy consumption. Wind , Biomass, geothermal , Solar thermal wave tidal all have role to play in reducing GHG intensity.

Then of course there is energy efficiency. Have you ever calculated the potential saving achievable from conservation and efficiency. Note the 6- 10 fold difference in energy consumption of a LCD screen and a conventional TV tube. and so on.

One can reduce GHG emission by 70% for motor vehicle transport by shifting from a 4x4 gas guzzler to an energy efficient high pressure diesel over night.

You dont have to wait until 2050 to get the saving.
Your energy-in energy-out analysis has merit , but it misses the point in the conversation of about a clean energy future.

George Blahusiak

805/32 Dumond Street
Bentley, W.A, 6102

Tel: (08) 9458-9484