

## Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-11/0023.html>

---

**From:** Tim O'Flaherty (*pinwheels\_Fudge\_\_at\_gwi.net*)

**Date:** 10/31/04

Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 06:56:26 -0500

"Franz Heymann" <notfranz.heyman@btopenworld.com> wrote in message news:clqf2\$89a\$1@hercules.btinternet.com...

>

> "Tim O'Flaherty" <pinwheels\_Fudge\_\_@gwi.net> wrote in message  
> news:l9udnYSkGYY8Wh3cRVn-tQ@gwi.net...

>>

>> "Franz Heymann" wrote:

>>

>> <Snip>

>>

>>> So let's start charging for the costs of reprocessing and

>>> vitrification of

>>> waste – both existing stockpiles and those from the projected

> rosy

>>> future

>>> with nukes replacing carbon, and put that charge on the utility

>>> bill, then

>>>> see how many new nuke plants we see.

>

> I did not say the above, in spite of Tim's initial sentence.

Sorry for the confusion, I left my statement to give context to your's.

>>>

>>> I fear we will have to see them, whatever the cost. There is no

> other

>>> way available yet to supplant the fossil fuel power stations.

>>

>> Whatever the cost?

>

> Yes.

>

This assumes that the market can and will support this. So far that hasn't been the case. It also assumes that we will consume ( in my view waste) resources in the future at the same rate as we do now. Bush made the comment that "The American way of life is not negotiable." a more accurate

sci.energy: Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

assessment would be that the American way of life is not sustainable.

> > > > *Here's Japan's answer...*  
> > > >  
> > > > [ *Four years later, the implementation of the pluthermal plan,*  
> *under*  
> > > *which*  
> > > > *plutonium–uranium mixed oxide fuel (MOX) was to be used in*  
> > > *conventional*  
> > > > *nuclear reactors, was suspended when British Nuclear Fuels Ltd.*  
> *was*  
> > > *found to*  
> > > > *have falsified data on MOX fuel.(\*). Implementation of the plan*  
> *was*  
> > > > *subsequently postponed to 2007.*  
> > > >  
> > > > > *As a result, stocks of spent nuclear fuel at nuclear power*  
> *plants*  
> > > *have been*  
> > > > *increasing.*  
> > >  
> > > *That is merely evidence of the criminal culpability of BNFL.*  
>  
> > *BNFL was bankrupt at the time.*  
>  
> *BNFL has neve yet been declared bankrupt.*  
>

Nor would I be even if I were 46 billion pounds in debt and the government intervened by picking the taxpayer's pocket to cover my deficits. A rose by any other name.... in this case still stinks to high heaven. You can hide behind legalisms and semantics all you want, bankrupt they are.

<http://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/nuclear/plutonium/LMAoutline0702.htm>

[On November 28th 2001 Patricia Hewitt, Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, announced that a LMA would be established to take responsibility (in 2003 or 2004) for managing all the country's civil nuclear liabilities. Currently these liabilities are the responsibility of British Nuclear fields (BNFL) and stand at about £46 billion of which £5 billion arise from the nuclear–weapon programme. These long–term liabilities exceed BNFL's assets. The company is bankrupt. The NDA is a device for preventing BNFL from going bankrupt, a situation that the government appears to regard as unacceptably embarrassing.]

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2091561.stm>

[The huge liabilities of cleaning up the radioactive waste which has accumulated over 50 years has left BNFL effectively bankrupt, it emerged last year.]

sci.energy: Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

> > *I'm not aware of their current economic*  
> > *status*  
>  
> *It is still a going concern.*  
>

If by "going concern" you mean welfare queen to end all welfare queens you are correct. Going to hell in a handbasket is a more apt description.

This is the path nuke advocates would plot for our future? I don't think so, not sustainable.

<Snip>

Regards,  
Tim O