



# Debunking the Green Myth

Humans have been telling stories and believing mythology since ancient times, and even today, people still drink the kool aid when told to by “politically-correct” snake oil salesmen. The promise of green jobs and a clean energy future has roused the masses and sent the world rushing headlong into the myth that the world is coming to an end from accelerated cooling and increased levels of carbon dioxide in the air, at the same time the whole world teeters on the brink of financial collapse. The hot air being espoused by Al Gore and other environmental alarmists misuses, distorts, and ignores the vast reams of data that contradict their dour visions as they continue to hype doom in order to survive monetarily and politically.

Modern environmentalism, born in the radical movements of the 1960s, is an ideology very much like Marxism which pretended to base its social platform on a scientific theory of economic relations. Like Marxists, environmentalists have had to force the facts to prove their theory along with its hostility to economic growth and technological progress in one of the biggest political scams ever perpetrated. As H. L. Mencken said, “...*the desire to save the world usually fronts a desire to rule it.*”

The advocates of global warming have ignored the fact that the continuation of a decade of stable or slightly cooling weather was completely unpredicted by their climate models. Accurate temperature measurements from satellites and balloons show that the planet has cooled significantly in the last two or three years, losing in only 18 months 15% of the claimed warming which took over 100 years to appear. That warming was only one degree Fahrenheit at any rate, and even part of that results from ground station readings inflated due to the “urban heat island effect”, i.e. local heat retention due to urban sprawl, not global warming. These false readings are programmed into disreputable climate models which only confirm that garbage in is garbage out.

The *Inconvenient Truth* spin master would have us believe that slight temperature rises are disastrous because ice caps will melt and people will die. However, every mild winter in the UK saves 20,000 cold-related deaths, and throughout all of northern Europe, mild winters save hundreds of thousands of lives each year. The truth is that parts of ice caps are melting, yet other parts are thickening. Data from ice core samples shows that in the past, temperatures have risen by ten times the current rise, and fallen again, in the space of a human lifetime.

Mindless advocates of green also promote a false doctrine of soaring air pollution as the culprit in fossil fuel use and would institute draconian cuts in fossil fuel emissions, such as suggested by the Kyoto Protocol, which would cost nearly \$250 trillion over the next century. This, when the current yearly U.S. gross domestic product is just \$10 trillion (the value of all goods and services produced within the country’s borders), and barely rising.

## Air Quality Today

Objective, uncontroversial data show that concentrations of sulfur dioxide are down 80 percent in the U.S. since 1962, carbon monoxide levels are down 75 percent since 1970, nitrogen oxides are down 38 percent since 1975, and ground level ozone is down 30 percent since 1977. These trends are also mirrored in all other developed countries.

In fact, current carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere are only 350 parts per million, and have been 18 times higher in the past when cars, factories, and power stations did not exist, proving levels rise and fall without mankind's help. More importantly, 96.5% of all carbon dioxide emissions are from natural sources, and humans are responsible for just 3.5%, with 0.6% coming from vehicle fuel, and about 1% from fuel to heat buildings. Yet vehicle fuel (petroleum) is taxed at 300% while fuel to heat buildings is taxed at 5%, even though buildings emit nearly twice as much carbon dioxide. Worse still, both water vapor and methane are far more powerful gases than carbon dioxide, yet they are ignored by the pundits.

The world uses hydrocarbons for 90 percent of its energy, but cannot quit using hydrocarbons anytime soon because its daily consumption is equivalent to 226 million barrels of oil, equal to the total daily output of twenty-seven Saudi Arabias. This translates into nearly 7 billion horsepower a day, with the U.S. leading the world in reliable horsepower and producing about 74 percent of the primary energy it consumes; and, it has more hydrocarbon reserves than any other nation. Yet, despite voracious consumption, the U.S. leads the world in energy efficiency and per capita carbon emission reductions over the last fifteen years.

## Power Hungry

In his well-written and well-argued book, *Power Hungry*, Robert Bryce contends that many of the present notions being discussed for replacing fossil fuels with wind, solar, biomass, efficiency, or reducing emissions via carbon capture and storage, are just plain myths. While still being supportive of efforts to diversify energy supply and ensure its security, he argues correctly that the only plausible path for a significant decarbonization of the global economy is the transitional, fossil fuel use of relatively-clean natural gas while the world prepares for nuclear power. With new discoveries of extensive shale deposits in the United States, along with greatly improved extraction technologies, natural gas is a readily available fossil fuel that burns 50 percent cleaner than coal, emits no toxic particles, and is rapidly becoming a low-cost energy provider that appeals to consumers.

In promoting nuclear power as *“the only always-on, no-carbon source that can replace significant amounts of coal in our electricity generation portfolio”*, Bryce points out succinctly that all of France's nuclear waste from its 50 or more nuclear power plants is stored in a single facility the size of a soccer field when supporting modular nuclear units in the U.S., some as small and economical as 25 megawatts. If nuclear power ultimately becomes the main provider for the electricity sector, which constitutes nearly 40 percent of America's total energy use, this would also accelerate the de-carbonization of the transportation and heating sectors as well.

The high power density of reliable fossil fuels, reflected in watts, BTUs, or horsepower, has been responsible for the huge technological advances of the past two centuries. However, a

gullible public deluged with reams of intellectual, scientific dishonesty increasingly seems willing to trade the high power density of coal, natural gas, and oil for low-power density sources of wind and solar.

### China's Emergence

Bryce shows that just one modern coal mine in Kentucky, the 35<sup>th</sup> largest in the U.S., produces nearly as much energy as all wind and solar energy produced in America. And the natural gas production from just one state, Oklahoma, produces well over nine times as much energy as all U.S. wind and solar, a reminder that a transition to wind and solar power would take decades, and be so astronomically expensive that it would make the U.S. strongly reliant on China for turbines.

Those who think more hybrid cars, wind machines, and solar cells will free the U.S. from its dependence on imports will be very surprised to discover that those technologies hinge on rare earth elements obtainable almost exclusively in China, which largely explains why the Chinese are quickly becoming a dominant manufacturer and exporter of green technologies. When even a pure-bred capitalist like Donald Trump says, ***“China is selling us everything, taking our money, and then loaning it back to us. It’s an end game that destroys America”***, it may be time to take notice.

### Wind & Hot Air

On Earth Day, 2009, President Obama stated, ***“Today, America produces less than 3 percent of our electric through renewable sources like wind and solar combined.....less than 3 percent. Now, in comparison, Denmark produces almost 20 percent of their electricity through wind and power.”***

Yet, despite Denmark’s massive investments in wind power, which accounts for 13.4 percent of all electricity in the country (not 20 percent), they still get 51 percent of their primary energy from oil, compared to 40 percent in the U.S., and greenhouse gas emissions have actually increased (by 2.1 percent) as the use of wind energy has doubled. Wind-generated energy is either immediately available when you need it because it can’t be stored, or you use another energy source, sometimes coal, sometimes natural gas. Coal in Denmark’s case, all of which it imports.

Even Texas, which ranks sixth in the world in total wind power production capacity, and which hails some of the leading U.S. proponents of wind power, harnesses just 8.7 percent of its installed wind capability during peak demand periods because, sadly, the wind doesn’t blow in summer when it’s needed most. The net result is that just 1% of the state’s reliable energy needs comes from wind, according to the Electric Reliability Council of Texas which runs the state’s electricity grid. The irony of wind power is that it doesn’t replace power plants, it only adds to them.

Self-serving energy gurus like T. Boone Pickens ignore the fact that building a wind farm requires 45 times the land mass of a nuclear power plant to produce a comparable amount of power, and necessitates hundreds of miles of high-voltage lines to get the energy to its customers because it’s in the middle of nowhere to begin with. Worse still, this huge sprawl of giant turbines and pylons requires 32 times more concrete and 139 times more steel to build than a gas-fired plant.

Believing that either wind, or low-performance and high cost solar technology could put a dent in the use of fossil fuels is like believing that a book of matches could melt a glacier. Similarly, believing that corn and cellulosic ethanol are friends of the environment or consumers in providing the holy grail of future energy needs is just plain naïve. The truth is that they reduce efficiency and performance, even damaging machine engines, and raise the cost of food by shrinking food supply and depleting millions of acres of soil while siphoning off a virtual sea of water.

### Cap & Trade

Advocates of green energy and environmental protection are mainly focused only on carbon emissions, neglecting almost any other environmental impact such as land use, aesthetics, noise, material use, water use, induced development patterns, and more. These dreamers know full well that pushing cap and trade, energy taxes, and renewable energy credits for reducing carbon dioxide emissions will be used *only* if the government continues to subsidize these alternative sources, all at the expense of tax and ratepayers.

Furthermore, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) makes plants grow more vigorously. This creates a natural buffer against global warming caused by CO<sub>2</sub> because, as CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations increase so does plant consumption of this gas. This makes global warming by carbon emissions literally impossible as long as there is plant life on earth. Also, NASA recently discovered that lightning strikes in the atmosphere break up NO<sub>2</sub> into pure nitrogen and oxygen, more commonly referred to as air. Global warming is a scam.

The overwhelming preponderance of rational scientists debunk global warming as the myth of world leaders determined to secure their 15 minutes of fame by keeping the masses alarmed from an endless parade of imaginary threats while imposing even more government standards in order to lead them to safety. In fact, over 18,000 scientists worldwide recently signed a petition called The Oregon Petition which says that there is no evidence for the man-made global warming theory nor for any impact from mankind's activities on climate.

### Obama Administration

Finally, the Obama Administration's push to create "Green Jobs" to employ more Americans by touting environmental initiatives is some of the same nonsense that asserts that cap and trade is a jobs program. A recent Brookings Institution report estimates that by 2025, even though some jobs in solar panel manufacturing will be gained by the Waxman-Markey Cap and Trade bill, over 40% of jobs in coal-related industries and 35% in crude oil-related industries will be lost because of it. If the Obama Administration argued that we should further regulate and confuse the tax code to create more jobs for lawyers and accountants, even simple-minded, mythology-believing Americans would run them out of office on a rail.

At the recent White House "Jobs Summit" attended by business, labor, academic and environmental leaders, Obama once again hailed Cash for Clunkers as a success the Administration should build on for future job creation. What? The program was a success only in that it got consumers to accept \$3 billion in free money. It was not cost effective, and it certainly didn't create jobs. Edmunds.com estimates that it cost taxpayers \$24,000 for every new car sale generated.

Even President Obama admitted that *"true economic recovery is only going to come from the private sector."* So, if Obama really believes the private sector will lead to true economic recovery, why does his Administration keep proposing to burden it with more taxes, more

government spending, and more regulation? A true recovery will only happen when prevailing pundits realize that regulation does not create jobs.

### **Final Word**

Perhaps, an Internet blogger describing *“a stupid, politically polluted population”* said it best when he queried, *“If a volcano can puke out more crap in 1 second than I can out of my smoker lungs and my 76 duster going down the ¼ mile in 13 seconds 3 times a year after a steak dinner, then what the heck’s the problem?”*

Note: It must be stated here that, in an effort to be socially and environmentally conscious, and well, yes, profitable, **PERMA•CRETE®** has reformulated its products so that all are “green” with mostly renewable and recyclable raw materials, and environmentally safe with extremely low VOCs. However, this doesn’t justify the world’s gullibility in accepting the blatantly false data propelling the green movement, nor does it impugn **PERMA•CRETE®**’s quest for existence and survival.

---

Article by George A. Henderson, President, CEO, Quality Systems, Inc/ **PERMA•CRETE®** All Rights Reserved 2010

#### ***Research Sources:***

CNNMoney.com  
“Power Hungry” by Robert Bryce  
Buildings.com  
TCSDaily.com  
MNN.com  
Edmunds.com  
FindArticles.com  
Larry King Live  
WorldChanging.com  
Brookings Institution  
Amazon.com  
RobertBryce.com  
NYTimes.com  
WSJ.com  
Wall Street Journal  
WordPress.com  
Tennessean  
ERCouncil of Texas  
Internet Search Engines  
QSI Quality Control Research