

SPEECH TO THE BRUGES GROUP BY JEREMY NIEBOER

CLIMATE CHANGE POSTURING OF THE EU HAS DANGEROUSLY DISTORTED UK ENERGY POLICY



For the entire 13 years of its administration the Labour administration was governed by the illusion that, by legislation, it could so limit CO2 emissions as to confine a predicted rise in global temperature to 2° – the target 'set' by the EU at its Council Meeting in June 1996 – and again at the EU Council Meeting of March 2007 heralding the its 20:20:20 policy. You will recall that this is the policy that requires that 20% of energy in the EU to be obtained from 'renewable' sources and that greenhouse gas emissions be cut by to 80% of 1990 levels, all by 2020.

It is now clear that the Coalition has set out upon the same vain pursuit.

This obsession with CO2 emissions has resulted in:-

- A. a complete and futile submission to the delusion that wind power is 'clean', is 'cheap' and is 'renewable' energy; and
- B. a scandalous failure to assure for adequate, secure, stable and affordable energy - free from dependence on diminishing fossil fuels - that only Nuclear power provides.

The consequences of this colossal ineptitude are that we face a 42% shortfall of generating capacity within 6 years – disregarding the expected sharp rise in demand for energy over this period which has been forecast by US Energy Information Administration for the period 2007 – 2035. 8 of the 9 nuclear plants built 30/40 years ago are now being phased out and most large coal and oil fired stations are in line for closure by 2016 under the EU 2001 Large Combustion Plants Directive - a cumulative loss of 19GW out of a national requirement of 45GW.

This shortfall cannot be met in time except by immediate construction of gas fired power stations – so increasing our dependence on vulnerable foreign imports and on fossil fuels. The Renewable Energy Foundation has concluded that by 2020 80% of gas supplies will be imported. There is no plan or strategy proposed by the UK Government or by the EU Commission which will provide energy that is not derived from fossil fuels and which is from a secure source, and adequate to meet demand at affordable prices.

Must there not be overwhelming justification for policies which are putting our prosperity in such jeopardy and are resulting in our deepening dependence on Russia for imports of fossil fuels?

The EU Commission will say that '*Climate Change is the defining challenge of our times*' (Connie Hedegaard EU Commissioner for Climate Action Speech to European Parliament 22 Jan 2010) justifying fundamental change in the economies of Member States.

However the answers to 3 basic questions show that the case for man made damaging global warming is riven with doubt. Let me briefly put these questions and set out the basic evidence.

Question 1. If we accept that man made CO2 emissions do indeed cause damaging global warming can EU and UK Climate Change policies have any effect in preventing it?

Answer No. The UK emits less than 2% of global man made CO2. So such policies are entirely futile unless applied by China, India and Russia. Yet by mid 2007 China, alone, was building one coal fired power station every 4 days. Copenhagen ended all such hopes of world wide action on CO2 emissions as may have been entertained, leaving the EU absurdly isolated.

Question 2 Does man made CO2 actually cause damaging increases in global temperature?

Answer There is no cogent and compelling evidence of this. To understand the significance of atmospheric CO2 we need to put the essentials of the evidence in their proper context:

- 80% of the 'greenhouse' effect is caused by water vapour – clouds. CO2 makes up just 0.0385% of atmospheric gas - of which only 3.3% is man-made.
- Atmospheric carbon is also recycled every 4/5 years by "sinks"- the oceans (90bn tonnes p.a) and vegetation (110bn tonnes p.a). So much is acknowledge by one of the founders of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- Importantly there is no correlation between global temperature and atmospheric CO2 levels.
 - The period 1850 – 2010 saw a steady and consistent increase in atmospheric CO2 - by as much as 35% – indeed levels have risen by no less than **3% p.a** for the last 10 years.
 - But this gradual year on year rise is not matched by global temperature record which has a chaotic pattern. From 1910 – 1940 it

rose 0.4° – it fell 0.2° from 1940 to 1976 only to rise again by 0.5° until 1998. Since then it has shown a slight fall.

- Indeed global temperature is now up to 3° below what it was in the Roman and Medieval Warmings when there was no man-made CO₂.
- There is no 'Tipping Point' beyond which temperature rises inexorably out of 'control' – despite the sensation seeking statements of Mr Blair in his open letter to EU leaders of March 2006. At 400 ppm additional concentrations of CO₂ do not increase its 'trapping' effect – the process resembles putting up curtains to keep out light – putting up more than 3 or 4 adds nothing. (See Professor Hoyle "Ice" 1981 at p.123: - and see Professor Ian Plimer "Heaven and Earth" 2009 at pp.374/5 for explanations of this phenomenon).
- The evidence provided by Antarctic ice cores suggests that over the ages temperature rises are likely to precede CO₂ rises by 500/1000 years – nor is this surprising given that the oceans contain nearly 40,000 bn tonnes of carbon – 50 times the atmospheric content - and that heat causes release from the oceans of carbon in the form of CO₂.
- Finally, even the IPCC 2007 Report admits that an increase of up to 3° will be beneficial to food production –itself 'predicting' an average global temperature increase of 2.9°.

Question 3 Is the planet actually heating up as so alarmingly predicted by some? (see e.g. the *Stern Report 2006*). That is to say beyond normal parameters looked at over adequate time scales?

Answer. No it is not. The rise of 0.7 degrees in the period from 1890 – 1998 is normal with the planet moving out of the Maunder Minimum or 'Little Ice Age' after 1850. Indeed global temperature has fallen since 1998 with the fall in the year to January 2008 the steepest since 1880.

I have to tell you that none of these facts are in serious dispute

Yet the EU Commission and the UK Government are still formulating policy depending for its justification on the spectre of CO₂ and what it portends for mankind. 2008 was the high point of fantasy in a decade of delusion with 2 astounding enactments being imposed.

- The UK enactment was the infamous Climate Change Act – requiring UK greenhouse gas emissions to be cut to 20% of the 1990 levels by 2050 and to 66% of those levels by 2020. Given the rise in CO₂ levels since 1990 these cuts are far greater in reality and would, if implemented, fatally maim our entire economy.
- The EU brought in its Renewables Directive – imposing an obligation on the UK to ensure that at least 15% of all its energy is obtained from so-called 'renewable' sources by 2020. The practical effect of this is to require that wind power energy be

increased over 10 years by over 10 times the then actual level of contribution to our energy needs.

It is as if rational analysis has 'Gone with the Wind'. It must be understood that for these purposes 'renewable' energy in truth means wind power since both nuclear and hydroelectric generation are excluded from definitions adopted by EU and UK legislation. But the notion that wind power is capable of meeting anything more than a derisory percentage of required electricity generation is simply fantasy. It is an illusion to deal with a delusion.

It is necessary to examine closely the extent to which any dependence can be place on wind generated electricity. Wind power suffers from 3 grave flaws:-

- It is grotesquely inadequate;
- It is nearly 3 times as costly as conventionally generated electricity; and
- Its adoption involves severe environmental damage;

1. Inadequacy

Wind power suffers from wind intermittency – wind turbines are ineffective at wind speeds of less than 12mph and cut out at 56 mph wind speeds. For this reason onshore wind turbines operate at only 25% of nominal capacity with offshore wind turbines a little better at 30%. As we all know on cold high pressure days when power demand is high there is no wind. This means that wind turbines require continuous back up from conventional power stations since production cannot be stored. Storage is only possible using hydroelectric generation.

Professor David McKay (Professor of Physics Cambridge and Chief Scientific Adviser to DECC) - by no means sceptical in his views on Climate Change - gives an example of the futility of wind power. Prof McKay estimates that the maximum land mass that could realistically be dedicated to wind turbines would be 10% of the UK land mass – an area the size of Wales and Cheshire. This would accommodate about 125,000 turbines - twice the entire world wide number and 50 times the wind power of Denmark. Yet this concentration of wind turbines would produce only 20Kilowatt hours per day per person. (*Prof MacKay – 'Sustainable Energy – Without the Hot Air' 2009*)

What does this mean in practical terms? Professor McKay explains that this is:

- Just ½ (one half) of power used by a person driving an average car 50km per day; or
- Only **16%** of UK daily energy consumption per person (125kWh/day)

As Christopher Booker points out tellingly the 18,000 turbines in Germany - 31% of world total - produced 3.48 GW in 2006– less than the UK's Drax coal fired power station coal at 3.9GW.

2. Environmental damage

This falls under a number of heads.

- We all know the impact that turbines have on visual amenities. The latest turbines are nearly 1½ x the height of Salisbury Cathedral (approx 600'). Our countryside is renowned for its small scale beauty - an irreplaceable national asset. It is being wantonly destroyed by this delusion.
- Wind power actually encourages the use of conventional coal fired stations to provide the 75% back up of power generation that is needed – more Wind – more Emissions.
- The demand on resources for turbine construction is vast. For every 1million tons of concrete/steel required for nuclear construction 7.5million are needed for offshore turbines (*Prof MacKay – 'Sustainable Energy – Without the Hot Air' 2009 at p.62*)

3. Cost

A Royal Academy of Engineering Report shows the cost of producing a Kw hour of electricity using Gas, Coal, Nuclear power and Wind power – its findings are as follows:-

Onshore Wind –	5.4p per kw/hour – over 2x Gas/Coal/Nuclear
Offshore	7.2p – approx 3x Gas/Coal/Nuclear
Gas/Coal	2.2p/2.5p
Nuclear	2.3p

For all these reasons Denmark's state owned power company has now announced that it is to abandon future onshore wind turbine generation. This is a major turning point given that Denmark is the world's most wind turbine intensive country.

UK Climate Change policies – dominated by the 2008 legislation - are enforced by a number of measures - none of which fall within the scope of popular knowledge. They include:• Renewable Obligation Certificate penalties and subsidies • the Climate Change Levy (a tax on energy) • Carbon Reduction Scheme penalties recently in force • EU Emissions Trading Scheme.

The cumulative impact of such Climate Change policies on electricity prices for industrial users has been the subject of 2 recent documents published by BERR and DECC. [*BERR's 'UK Renewable Energy Strategy Consultation' June 2008: DECC's 'The Renewable Strategy' of July 2009*]. A booklet published by Civitas contains an analysis of these estimates by Ruth Lea Director of Arbuthnot Banking Group and Jeremy Nicholson Director of the Energy Intensive Users Group and illuminates this appalling imposition on manufacturing industry.

The increases in costs of electricity to industrial users are as follows:-

1. Costs to be incurred by 2020 - **55%**
2. Additional costs of complying with EU Renewables Directive 2008 = **15%**

Thus by 2020 the minimum increases in costs of electricity for industry will be **70%**. Other studies put the likely increase as high as 140% (The Cumulative Impact of Climate Change Policies on UK Energy Intensive Industries: TUC and Energy Intensive Users Group).

It is not surprising that business is migrating to jurisdictions that do not impose these appalling burdens. Nor is it only heavy industry with its energy costs that are so affected. Santander in 2009 cancelled its planned European data centre facility in London due to such costs – a major Data Centre facility uses as much power as a city the size of Leicester. Yahoo also moved its European HQ from London citing the high electricity costs of operating in the UK.



These policies, that are causing such damage to our economy at a time of financial crisis, are governed by the malign dominion of the EU Commission

To take just one example of EU posturing, Connie Hedegaard EU Commissioner for 'Climate Action' in a speech to the European Parliament on 22 January 2010 declared that "*Climate Change is the defining challenge of our times*". One really wonders what world she inhabits that regards as secondary the emergence of an Iranian

nuclear arsenal, poverty and tyranny in the African continent, the collapse of the fabric of family and social order in inner cities and the likelihood of a trade war between the USA and China.

Such comments are the more absurd when one realizes that the real crisis is in truth what EU has itself brought about, namely the impending decimation of our power supplies and the utter failure to replace dependence on fossil fuels with stable secure adequate and affordable energy which only nuclear power generation can provide.

It is necessary to consider just briefly the legal criteria which govern the actions of the Commission on environmental matters. This sector of 'competence' is what is known as a 'shared competence' (Lisbon Article 4.2) which enables the EU to override national action if it decides to act. QMV has applied since the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). Under Article 191 of Lisbon this competence now extends to '*combating climate change*'.

Article 191.3 of Lisbon (re-enacting earlier legislation) requires the EU, in relation to environmental matters, to take account of certain specific factors including ;

- All available scientific and technical data; and
- The potential benefits and costs of action or lack of action

Yet notwithstanding this clear direction the EU Commission has acted in breach of its obligations without any regard to the requirements that have been imposed on it in mandatory and unusually lucid terms.

It has failed to initiate any analysis of the evidence for global warming (if any), its causes, effects and possible mitigating action, it has commissioned no independent reports or research, it has held no hearings with or without sworn evidence. Its aim has been solely to posture from the outset as setting a moral example to the world for the purpose of extending its 'competence'.

It has simply relied, without any such enquiry, on the Intergovernmental Reports on Climate Change and on the Stern Review. It is therefore with a summary review of these documents that I will conclude my remarks

The 1996 IPCC Report for the first time included statements as to the existence of man made causation of global warming. The Summary for Policy Makers, which is intended as a summary of the fully developed findings in the main report and is prepared for heads of government and policy makers, contained the statement that there was '*evidence of discernible human influence*' on global temperature. Yet on investigation by the Wall Street Journal it became clear that the main report contained no such finding. The actual finding in the main report was that '*no study to date has positively attributed climate change to human cause*'. This shameful re-writing of the Report by the environmental activists deprives the Summary of any validity and condemns it as deceitful.

The 2001 IPCC Report predicted a catastrophic rise in global temperature by 5.8⁰ this century. It relied on what has become known as the 'Hockey Stick' graph prepared one Michael Mann which showed a flat line of global temperature over the last 1000 year with a violent rise this century. However the graph was fundamentally flawed. It suppressed the evidence of the Mediaeval and Roman Warmings. Worse still it used a false 'principal component analysis' so that whatever data was fed into the computer model it would produce the hockey stick effect. It was exposed by two reports to two separate Congress Committees in 2006. It has been given no credence since then by any responsible entity save for the EU Commission.

The Stern Review (October 2006) was commissioned by Mr Blair in the belief that it would add lustre to his claim to be leading the EU on the dangers of global warming. It was preceded by his Open Letter to EU leaders in March 2006 in which he asserted that there would be in - '*10-15 years a catastrophic tipping point*' when global temperature would reach a point at which it could no longer be controlled. Such a contention has, as I have shown, no basis in science.

The Stern Review was not the result of any independent research commissioned for the purpose. It altogether ignored the devastating Reports to Congress that year. It ignored all contrary scientific research. It has been exposed as failing to adhere to normal criteria for works of scientific import (see for example Professor Op Cit Plimer pp476-480). It was condemned by many respected scientists including Dr Richard Tol of the Economic and Social Research Institute Hamburg – author of the UN Handbook on Climate Change

assessment and a contributor to IPCC reports –who described it as '*alarmist and incompetent*'.

And yet the EU Commission relies on Stern totally for its centerpiece policies and policy documents including its 20:20:20 keystone strategy (emissions cut by 20% to achieve 80% of 1990 levels by 2020, 50% cut below 1990 by 2050, 20% EU energy from 'renewables' by 2020, 10% of transport fuel from 'biofuel' by 2020), its Green Paper (June 2007) and White Paper (1 April 2009) 'Adapting to Climate Change'. Above all it used Stern to justify the "*transformation of the European economy requiring major political social and economic effort*" (Commission 'Communication to European Parliament' "Europe's Climate Change Opportunity" 23.01.2008)

Citizens of all EU Member States might pause to ask if it is really credible that policies involving the devastating transformation of their countries' economies should be founded on reports and a Review tainted with such flaws.

The entire EU project on "Climate Change" is an appalling lesson to us all of the damage that an undemocratised supranational government can inflict on its subjects. The measures that the EU is imposing on European nations under the banner of "*fighting climate change*" will bring disaster on all of its Member States on a scale that utterly overwhelms the follies of the CAP and Common Fisheries Policy - from which at least some Member States derive benefit.

It is clear to all who have reviewed the stages by which we have been brought to this crisis that the EU has betrayed its 'citizens' by inciting serious alarm on this most emotive subject with no regard for the fears, costs and privations its extravagant posturing will inflict, whilst leaving us more dependent than ever on the very fossil fuels whose emissions are the object of its legislation.