

Alternative Energy Is Not The Answer, Part 2



By Pastor Roger Anghis

July 9, 2023

It goes without saying that we have not found a good source of energy that can even come close to the effectiveness and reliability of fossil fuels with the exception of nuclear. With Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima we have had very little downside with nuclear. These three incidences do make me shy away from nuclear but the efficiency cannot be beat.

Liberals are trying to shove EVs down our throats but there is so much that can and does go wrong with them not to mention the mining disaster they cause. Here are a few facts that advocates for the EV simply ignore. They are very important facts that negatively affect every state in the union.

This informatization is directed to Californian multiply it by 49 and you can see the nightmare that it developing.

1. EVs are powered by fossil fuels. According to the [U.S. Energy Information Administration \(EIA\)](#), fossil fuel-based power plants – coal, oil, or natural gas – create about 60% of the nation's electrical grid, while nuclear power accounts for nearly 20%.
2. The batteries of EVs rely on cobalt. An estimated [70% of the global supply](#) of cobalt emanates from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a country with deplorable working conditions, especially for children.

3. A [study released](#) earlier this year by an environmental group showed that nearly one-third of San Francisco's electric charging stations were non-functioning. The population of San Francisco represents roughly two percent of California.
4. Supporters of the California law admit there will be a [40% increase in demand](#) for electricity, adding further strain to the grid and requiring increased costs for power and infrastructure.
5. According to one researcher, the strain of adding an EV is similar to adding "[1 or 2 air conditioners](#)" to your home, except an EV requires power year-round.
6. Today, 20 million American families, or one in six, have [fallen behind on their electric bills](#), the highest amount ever.
7. Utility companies will need to add \$5,800 in upgrades for every new EV for the next eight years in order to compensate for the demand for power. All customers will shoulder this cost.
8. The average price for an electric vehicle is currently \$66,000, up more than 13% in just the last year, costing an average of [\\$18,000 more](#) than the average combustible engine. Meanwhile, the median household income is \$67,521. For African American families, the average is \$45,870, and for Hispanic households, \$55,321.
9. A [2022 study](#) found that the majority of EV charging occurs at home, leaving those who live in multi-family dwellings (apartments) at a real disadvantage for charging.
10. The same study also noted that many drivers charge their EVs overnight when solar power is less available on the grid.[1]

I've always stated that liberals never count the cost of their proposed policies. This is one of them. I understand that science moves quickly but to achieve the goal, as some states do, of replacing 90% of the internal combustion vehicles when

the electrical grid in California cannot handle the load that is currently on it. The number of new power plants that we would have to build and keep in mind that these power plants use coal, and natural gas which are fossil fuels themselves. Nuclear power is the most efficient. The storage of nuclear waste is the biggest problem. If there is a meltdown, serious damage can be done to the immediate area. The long-term effects of traditional power plants can last for decades. It is very difficult to build any type of power that is 100% safe. ***Popular discussions about nuclear power eventually get around to at least one of five objections: It's not safe; no one knows what to do about waste; it's too expensive; it leads to nuclear weapons proliferation; or there isn't enough uranium. All of these objections are baseless.***

It's not safe (yes it is)

The Paul Scherrer Institut in Villigen PSI, Switzerland is a frequent European Community consultant concerning safety. Their collection of more than 33,000 records of accidents related to electricity production shows that nuclear power is the safest-ever way to make electricity, by a very wide margin. Only 46 fatalities are directly attributed to municipal nuclear power in its entire six-decade worldwide history, all at Chornobyl.[2] In my research I have found interesting fact MSM and science either ignore or simply refuse to address. With wind mills do not have that long of a shelf life in the field. How long does a wind turbine last? The ad copy says 25 years. But new research has chopped wind's life expectancy in half to 12 years.

"A study of almost 3,000 turbines in Britain – the largest of its kind – sheds doubt on manufacturers' claims that they generate clean energy for up to 25 years, which is used by the Government to calculate subsidies," [reports](#) the Daily Mail. "Professor Gordon Hughes, an economist at Edinburgh University and former energy advisor to the World Bank, predicts in the coming decade far more investment will be needed to replace

older and ineffective turbines – which is likely to be passed on in higher household electricity bills.”

Hughes found that onshore and offshore wind turbines degrade differently. The monthly load factors, or the amount of electricity generated as a percentage of their nameplate capacity, drops from 24% percent in the first year to 11% after 15 years.

Offshore wind, meanwhile, declines more drastically from 40% in year one to 15% after ten years. This should not be surprising, as saltwater is an incredibly hostile environment.

Larger turbines fare worse than smaller turbines, Hughes says.[1] It is also noteworthy to mention that a windmill has to run for 50 years just to pay back the energy it took to make it. We are finding out now that these machines on average only last 12. Is that really that good of an investment? It requires large quantities of fossil fuel materials to manufacture it and as of today, the blades are not recyclable. It does not produce the power they promised, lasts only 25% of the time they said it would.

Science is not moving as fast as what will be needed to develop the technology, we must have to reach the goals of the New Green Deal. And there is good reason for that, science cannot go that forward that fast.

Back in the '60s a guy developed a car that ran on hydrogen, water. Just a few days before he was going to release his findings he was killed and the government removed his test vehicle and all of his notes. Something happened to Tesla. Who's trying to keep what from the public?[3]

© 2023 Roger Anghis – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Roger Anghis: roger@buildingthetruth.org

Foot Notes

1. <https://www.zerohedge.com/technology/10-facts-electric-vehicle-advocates-dont-want-you-know>
2. <https://vsnyder.substack.com/p/five-myths-about-nuclear-power>
3. Defining America's Exceptionalism, Roger Anghis (Westbow Press, 2011) pp. 36-37