

## Re: Are nukes the answer to global warming?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-02/0463.html>

---

**From:** Richard Bell ([rlbell\\_at\\_csclub.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:rlbell_at_csclub.uwaterloo.ca))

**Date:** 02/11/05

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 18:00:17 +0000 (UTC)

In article <1108079955.347209.216660@l41g2000cwc.googlegroups.com>, AntiFossil <mike.krafka@gmail.com> wrote:

>Being new to this list, I had visions of settling in and taking some  
>time to get my bearings before even considering posting a comment, much  
>less a reply. Until I read this.

>

>< 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.>

>

>Bowling for critics? Not a bad idea for a hobby. Not a good idea for  
>public relations. And to think, you're discussing NUCLEAR POWER !

>Here's a novel idea. Instead of that whole, bowl em' over, shock n

>awe, "to heck with those stupid little technical thingy's"

>attitude....Hows' about we try this pardner? Make me believe that

>nuclear power is safe for my health, and my childrens health, and my

>planets health, by proving to me that it is, scientifically. Show me

>that those who want to profit from its production, have invested enough

>time, research, technologies, manpower, and resources to COMPLETELY

>understand how to manage it's production, from start to finish, and

>beyond.

The problem with your request is that no matter how much scientific proof is given that electrical production via nuclear power is just about the safest activity that mankind has ever embarked upon, and that its affect on the environment is on par with a lot of things that environmentalists want, the neo-luddites still insist that there is still enough doubt to deny a nuclear future.

The environazis are terrified by nuclear power, not because it is not as safe as its record proves it to be, but because the widespread use of nuclear power will make our consumer economy sustainable, with only moderate changes in the way materials are handled. Every one of those loudmouth environmentalists who insist on us living as agrarian peasants will have to go and find honest work, instead of scaring hardworking people into giving them money to scream at us.

>

>And now for the line that convinced me that you have got to be an

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

>elected official somewhere in the US...

>

><There will always be some screamin' meemies ... but if they're not TOO

>numerous they can

>be ignored.>

In situations where one side of an issue refuse to be convinced, and there is no middle ground, this is the only possible resolution. There is no way to please everybody on some issues, just look at abortion.

>

>Yes ladies and gentlemen, no surprise here, as I am sure we are all

>quite used to being ignored. What really pisses me off about this

>genius is that I have been to Chernyobyl. Not to the plant itself,

>mind you, but I have been close enough to see it quite clearly with my

>own eyes. I have met with two different russian women. Both of whom

>were once mothers. Both of whom were once wives. After learning their

>stories, I realized a thousand different things, all of which were

>both painful and eye opening to say the least. But for me, one of the

>most powerful impressions I came away from there with was the sight of

>these two Russian women leaving, after having spoken with me. They

>said their goodbyes to me, and I to them, and they turned around and

>left in absolute silence. That's the thing I remember about them most,

>as they walked away, hand in hand, two women who before this nightmare

>wouldn't have even looked twice at one another, now moved away from me

>in that gray Russian afternoon like one body, but without making so

>much as a rustle amongst the leaves. Dead silent.

Their stories are no different than a lot of people, the vast majority of whom had no involvement with nuclear power. More suffering came out of Bhopal than will ever be produced from aftereffects of Chernobyl. The recent tsunami makes even Chernobyl seem like a non-event. It has also brought people together, as tragedies always do [the last time I was with all six of my siblings was the death of our father, I am beginning to doubt that it will happen again, before our mother dies].

>

>I know only what they told me about life prior to the accident, but for

>my purposes here this much is important. They never complained. They

>never even thought about, or wanted to. They believed the government

>enough back then to at least provide for their safety. One of the

>women told me without, my even asking, " Today, I wouldn't even

>hesitate to go inside that building. I want to be with my family this

>much."

>

>I don't tell this story to depress anyone, that is not my goal. My

>goal is to re-connect people with people, and to remind those, who may

>have forgotten, that life is short, and has recently increased in

>intensity.

The apparent goal of your story is to show that nuclear power is bad, or that we should trust you, not mountains of scientific evidence, about the safety and environmental cleanliness of nuclear power. If I was cynical,

Re: Are nukes the answer to global warming?

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

I would believe that you are trying to milk the suffering of those women to advance your own agenda.

>*Now, more than ever, look out for each other.*

>

What do you think the nuclear advocates are trying to do?

Nuclear energy is carbon neutral and uses practically no land, compared to diffuse sources, like wind and solar. Really cheap electricity means that hydroponics can competitively produce food, which means less intensive farming, which leads to more land returning to nature.