

Re: Are nukes the answer to global warming?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-02/0371.html>

From: BlackWater (bw_at_barrk.net)

Date: 02/09/05

Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 22:48:01 GMT

On Tue, 08 Feb 2005 23:57:17 GMT, Dan Bloomquist
<EXTRAPublic21@lakeweb.com> wrote:

>
>
>Tim O'Flaherty wrote:
>> A solution must be politically,
>> technically AND economically feasible.
>
>This would seem to be an impossible requirement. Evidenced in that we
>still don't seem to have a 'solution'. Take 'politically' out and it
>would be readily feasible.

CAN'T take out "politically" ... indeed the 'technical'
and 'economical' parts are LESS important – as witnessed
in our Apollo program and Reagans 'Star Wars' hoax. Sell
the public FIRST and THEN worry about the money and
technical details.

>As you wouldn't take our last discussion to a conclusion, I'll do it
>now. The problem is not the technology. The problem is human. It may
>eventually turn out that we are not capable of using nuclear
>economically, but that will be because of the political nature of this
>beast. Nuclear is a sound technology; from mining to disposal. It is the
>perception that something is wrong with nuclear that has become the problem.

I think it *can* be used in an economic fashion.
The trick is creating enough momentum so that
most of the critics will be bowled-over. There
will always be some screamin' meemies ... but
if they're not TOO numerous they can be ignored.

Nuclear power is the obvious REALISTIC solution
to the presumed 'global warming' crisis – all
other proposed alternatives are pie-in-the-sky
either because of technical difficulties or
ridiculous costs. This has to be hammered in
until it overcomes the political appeal of

sci.energy: Re: Are nukes the answer to global warming?

those 'alternatives'.

Half the battle is in creating safer, cleaner, nuclear plants. They **MUST** be intrinsically safe so loss of coolant, terror attack or just inept employees **CANNOT** cause any kind of meltdown. The Three-Mile-Island and especially Chernobyl events are deeply engraved in the public consciousness and it will take a **TRUELY** safe design to get around that.

The waste disposal issue will always be plagued by the **NIMBY** phenomena, but by using remote lands already under federal jurisdiction this can be overcome. The 'pebble-bed' type reactor is both intrinsically safe **AND** leaves wastes nicely, strongly, encapsulated. Most of the research money should be shifted there so they can make the final refinements on the 'pebble' shells.

To overcome political resistance **SIGNIFICANT** improvements in safety and cleanliness will have to be demonstrated. The average Joe has to be **CONVINCED** ... and you'd better not be lying to him.