



DOOMED PLANET

solar panel III

# Diddler on the Roof

ALAN MORAN APR 28 2025

**S**ome primitive and isolated societies, when initially observing the wealth of foreigners, embraced “cargo cults”. Abandoning agriculture, they cleared vegetation to allow aircraft to land, thinking this would provide similar wealth. Instead, they experienced starvation. It is all too frequent for nations to face internally generated economic declines

Economic stagnation, and worse, has invariably followed adoption of the cult of scientific socialism. All triumphs of socialism prove to be short-lived: the expropriation of individuals’ private property brings wealth dissipation and

stagnation as vapid bureaucracies replace commercial management of productive activities and entrepreneurial activity grinds to a halt.

Internally generated self-harm has its most modern incarnation in the climate cult. Wherever this gains political ascendancy, subsidy-seekers foster inefficient “clean energy” to displace low-cost existing supplies.

Deindustrialisation with lower living standards follows.

On a global scale, the election of Donald Trump and the continued growth of China, India and other nations refusing to abandon cheap energy has negated the “clean energy” movement. But not so in Australia, which has accumulated subsidies and spending measures (costing **\$16 billion a year**) to eradicate coal use and push for net zero greenhouse emissions. In the process, energy costs have been shifted from among the world’s lowest to among the highest in the world, and industrial and agricultural capabilities have been seriously damaged, resulting in falling living standards.

**W**orse, Australia’s political support for renewables continues to snowball. The latest chapter is Labor’s \$2.3 billion subsidy program for household **batteries** and small commercial premises. The subsidy, at \$4,000 per roof, would reduce householders’ installed costs from **\$15,000** to \$11,000 and, according to the government, bring electricity savings of \$1,100 per year.

A standard 13 kWh battery under optimal conditions might get a solar household through the night, but it does not provide sufficient security for cloudy days. Moreover, the batteries only last an average of around 10 years. So, even without discounting for interest costs, the household installer, at best, breaks-even after a decade.

Meanwhile, the hapless renter or apartment owner suffers a dead loss by financing this latest green quackery. As with other renewable subsidies, the alleged gains to some customers come at the expense of others or taxpayers. The only beneficiaries are the suppliers of batteries and roof panels.

At a national level, the projected new storage from subsidies of \$2.3 billion and a presumed total cost of \$8.6 billion can only have a trivial effect in offsetting a wind/solar system’s inherent unreliability. The additional storage

financed by the subsidy would amount to 575,000 batteries. At 13 kWh per battery, that's 7.45 GWh of storage. But the well-regarded **Global Roam** consultancy estimates, even with highly optimistic assumptions, that Australia would require 9500 GWh of storage to support a system that relied on wind – and solar would likely need even more. This would cost some \$10 trillion, more than three times GDP!

Moreover, trivial though the contribution would be, the batteries' owners would find their outlays, rather than securing their own homes' reliability, compulsorily contributing to a *national* scheme of shoring up the grid. Such an all-hands-to-the-pump approach is proposed to tap the storage in EV batteries by the regulator, AEMO, in its 2024 **Integrated System Plan**.

**B**lackRock CEO **Larry Fink**, historically a leading supporter of green energy initiatives, has acknowledged that wind and solar alone “can't reliably keep the lights on” without “major breakthroughs in storage”. The improvement in battery economics would need to be a thousandfold if they were to allow wind and solar to offer reliable electricity supply solutions that match those of current coal/gas or nuclear systems.

Sadly, Peter Dutton declined **advice** to use the upcoming Australian election to provide a major policy alternative entailing departure from the Paris Accord 's goal of Net Zero. Dutton might have embraced coal as **Trump** has done and rejected subsidised renewables. But instead, as well as pursuit of “zero-emissions nuclear energy”, he reiterated the Coalition policy of a “balanced energy mix, including more renewables”.

Current energy policies of both the Coalition and the ALP are proven failures, having raised costs to households and commercial firms and shifted the nation in the direction of deteriorating productivity. Political support for existing policies indicates that tumescent energy costs have not registered with the electorate – or at least the cause of these cost increases have not been recognised. Perhaps only a catastrophic power failure would bring such recognition but such an event may not occur.

At least Dutton has refused to endorse the latest ALP subsidy for batteries, as well as rejecting the ALP's doomed hydrogen fantasies and their subsidy

packages. But this mild scepticism is insufficient to reignite the economy and, worse, it represents a timid lack of the leadership that has propelled into power reformers like Argentina's Milei, Italy's Meloni, and Trump himself.