

Re: Confused Logic 101

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-11/0574.html>

From: Dan Bloomquist (EXTRApblic21_at_lakeweb.com)

Date: 11/09/04

Date: Tue, 09 Nov 2004 00:33:35 GMT

Tim O'Flaherty wrote:

> *Sorry about that first one.*

>

>

> *"Dan Bloomquist" <EXTRApblic21@lakeweb.com> wrote in message*

> *news:418FC596.4080108@lakeweb.com...*

>

>>

>> *Thomas Lee Elifritz wrote:*

>>

>>> *And the evidence is clear, nuclear proliferation is a serious threat.*

>>

>> *As long as you agree, the threat is human.*

>

>

> *Nonsense.*

>

> *Something Tim failed to*

>

>> *understand.*

>

>

> *I understand that your statement is nonsense, a semantic exercise that puts*

> *solutions to a very real problem, nuclear weapons proliferation, out of*

> *reach since "the threat is human" and we can't do without them now can we.*

You keep claiming nuclear power as the source of weapons. I'd call that nonsense.

>

> *Nuclear comes from a Pandora's box. It would be seriously*

>

>> *difficult to put it back.*

>

>

> *You don't have to put it back, you need to use it where it makes sense.*

>

sci.energy: Re: Confused Logic 101

- > *One example of nuclear technology that doesn't make sense is reprocessing*
- > *spent reactor fuel to yield stocks of Pu. Your (and R.B.'s) claims of the*
- > *value of this as a fuel are belied by the fact that as reprocessing*
- > *continues the amount stored only grows larger. If it was so desirable*
- > *buyers would be purchasing it. They are not. Why not?*

Where did I ever make this claim? If reprocessed fuel is not used or stored for future use, Something is wrong with the use of the technology. I'd call that political, yes, again.

- > *As that is most likely, there is no good*
- >
- >> *reason not to use it as a source of peaceful energy.*
- >
- >
- > *The unresolved issue of waste is a damn good reason.*

We could dump it in the ocean and you know that.

- > *Nuclear weapons and*
- >
- >> *nuclear energy are distinct applications of nuclear. Ending nuclear*
- >> *energy would likely have a 'negative' effect on weapons.*
- >
- >
- > *Reducing stocks of separated Pu would have a negative effect on terrorist*
- > *opportunities. Continuing to reprocess increases those opportunities.*

We have been through this before and you _don't_ address it from what I see.

- > *Regards,*
- > *Tim O*

Get a decent newsreader.

Best, Dan.

--

<http://lakeweb.net>

<http://ReserveAnalyst.com>

No EXTRA stuff for email.

What can you see if you can't see it all...