

I petitum

The Bundestag [Federal Parliament of Germany] shall urge the [Federal] Department of Environment (BMUB) respectively Federal Minister Mrs. Barbara Hendricks, to correct the discrediting of critics of wind energy utilization in favor of unprejudiced statements in the publication "Renewable Energy - workbook for pupils - Elementary School" (Berlin 2010). This also applies to other stereotypes contained in the workbook.

II Background:

In the publication of, the BMUB can be read

"There are also people who are against wind turbines. Some animal protection activists fear that birds can get through the huge wings to damage. Residents who live adjacent to the plants, complain that the view over the landscape is disturbed and the wind turbines cause too much noise. But experts believe that the benefits of wind power outweigh those disadvantages and consider how you can take much more advantage of the wind energy. "

(Workbook http://www.igsz.eu/EE/ee_arbeitsheft-f-schueler_gs_bmub-BlN-2010.pdf p.11 bottom left)

III Reasons:

1. Explicitly as "professionals" those people are referred in the workbook, who trivialize the negative impact of wind turbines (WT) and want to use the wind energy even more. So the pupils shall believe, that critics of wind energy use are not worth being called professionals.

This subtle deliberate discrediting of wind energy critics can not be tolerated.

2. The lump-sum confrontation between people who are against wind turbines and those who want to use more wind energy, promotes a "black and white thinking" in students.

The work instruction in the workbook, to consider "the possible effects of a wind turbine on the landscape, the people and the animals" is reversed (with regard to a possibly critical result of the pupils' considerations) in its sense by the simultaneous prejudicial devaluation of such effects.

3. The workbook does not know the fact that there are people on many points of view to the topic "wind energy", who see the thing technical differentiated.

That critics (must) oppose a wind turbine project in evidently justified cases, is logical. People who act as experts (!), for example represent as ornithologists the legal demands of bird protection, do not only fear some deficits of wind energy.

Eg bird strike: Bird Strike must not not only to be feared, it is quite fact. It is therefore subject of legally binding avoidance goals (see §13 Federal Nature Conservation Act - BNatSchG, also with prohibitions in §39 and §44.) This can not be dismissed as a negligible or even more trivializing disadvantage.

4. Pupils in the primary school age will read the text so that the "experts" put the

disadvantages described therein, including significant noise-related stress, behind actual or alleged benefits of wind energy utilization. These disadvantages must not only be subject of fear, they are fact often enough. But minimizing these disadvantages as an essential goal is no question in the workbook, the word "trivialization" is all the more justified.

From the affected people's point of view such a behavior of these supposed "experts" would be simply disrespectful.

This disrespect indirectly also affects the courts, because they judge weighing the pros and cons of specific cases. They judge on legal basis, instead using a workbook's preferences in a flat review.

5. Undoubtedly, often the "Saint Florian principle" - (not in my backyard - NIMBY) applies. But at the other hand, the demand from residents or their representative politicians to save landscape quality is a valid concern.

Exceeding local consternations, Landscape is protected by public law (see §14 - BNatSchG).

Wind energy use and its effects on landscape have a legal basis (§35 sect.1 No.5 Building Code - BauGB), but not in any manner and not everywhere. Even more the minimization of this effect is a public legal goal (see. §13 and §15 sect. 1 BNatSchG), eg by proper siting. Effects of wind plants on the landscape must therefore be accepted as subject of public law, not as a a priori given fact in every kind of extent.

This legal duty of minimization is fulfilled extremely inadequate in practice.

Why is that important?

The petition refers explicitly to a specific instance of maladministration in the BMUB. It does not deal with the fundamental questions of the pros and cons of wind energy, which are sufficiently often the subject of many other petitions. It also fails - for the purposes of preservation of clarity - to address other shortcomings in the workbook. Those thoughts will be the object of further initiatives in terms of "BMUB and children".

The maladministration in the BMUB adressed by the petitum is particularly

- firstly, in the discrediting of critics of wind energy use,
- secondly, in the lack of goals of minimizing WKA caused disadvantages and
- thirdly, an irresponsible and deliberate indoctrination of children.

All this is accepted by the BUMB as a tribute in favor of alleged benefits of wind energy. This must be countered on a broad basis.