

Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-11/0035.html>

From: Franz Heymann (*notfranz.heyman_at_btopenworld.com*)

Date: 10/31/04

Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 14:26:56 +0000 (UTC)

"Tim O'Flaherty" <pinwheels_Fudge_@gwi.net> wrote in message
news:3IOdnbj2aukOTxncRVn-sg@gwi.net...

>

> "Franz Heymann" <notfranz.heyman@btopenworld.com> wrote in message
> news:clquf2\$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?

>>

sci.energy: Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

> > *Yes.*

> >

>

> *This assumes that the market can and will support this.*

Please believe me that the market will in due course support either this or another of the three most viable disposal methods, namely a deep hole below terra firma, killing the stuff with an accelerator driven reactor or throwing it into the deep ocean at a subduction zone.

> *So far that hasn't*

> *been the case.*

Only because the pressure for dealing with it has not yet become insurmountable.

> *It also assumes that we will consume (in my view waste)*

> *resources in the future at the same rate as we do now.*

^The rate is going to go up by orders of magnitude when China, India and Africa become fully industrialised.

> *Bush made the*

> *comment that "The American way of life is not negotiable."*

Thank god for small mercies.

> *a more accurate*

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

That is true. It has largely had its day and it will bow out with one hell of a lot of noise in the first half of the present century.

>

> > > > *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*

Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

sci.energy: Re: Can hydrogen deliver?

- > > *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. Youcan*
- > *hide*
- > *behind legalisms and semantics all you want, bankrupt they are.*

If you say so.

- >
- > <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.]*

Yes. Due to the fact that the government has been too scared of the non–nuclear lobby to start tackling the problem decades ago.

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.*

BNFL's position is precarious. I agree. It is to be ascribed to the incompetence of BNFL top brass and the lack of will on the part of the government (most governments) to get down to brass tacks about solving the problem.

Franz