

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-03/0211.html>

---

**From:** Clouseau2 ([eric\\_at\\_webmethods.com](mailto:eric_at_webmethods.com))

**Date:** 03/09/05

Date: 9 Mar 2005 10:53:09 -0800

owl wrote:

> On 8 Mar 2005 11:11:03 -0800, "Clouseau2" <[eric@webmethods.com](mailto:eric@webmethods.com)>

wrote:

>

> >owl wrote:

> >> On 7 Mar 2005 20:38:36 -0800, "Clouseau2" <[eric@webmethods.com](mailto:eric@webmethods.com)>

wrote:

> >>

> >> >owl wrote:

>

> >Uhh, I've been researching this stuff for over a year. EROEI ==

Energy

> >Returned on Energy Invested. Here is a chart of some common

returns:

> >

> >[http://www.abelard.org/briefings/energy-economics.asp#tarsands\\_table](http://www.abelard.org/briefings/energy-economics.asp#tarsands_table)

>

> >Note that tar sands are 1.5, Middle East oil 30+.

> >

> >I've read over 5 books on this subject. How many have you read?

>

> None. I caught on to the concept with a few links. 5 books, and

> you're still on the basics ... sigh ...

So, is the EROEI of the tar sands 1.5 or not? Oh, and I forgot to mention the massive quantities of fresh water and natural gas required to "cook" the tar sands. And the fact that mining the tarsands releases lots of greenhouse gases.

> >> It is actually an advantage for EROEI to go down in North America

> >> because at the right ROI and cost balance, it unlocks the economic

> >> viability of the Tar Sands (and it's 200 years of reserves).

Where, exactly, did that "200 years" # come from?

[ lost of condescending BS snipped ]

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

>

> >> >*The return is very good for the middle east, but it is atrocious  
for the*

> >> >*very mature fields in the USA.*

> >>

> >> >*Yea ... duhh. Since the cost of transportation is closer to zero*

at

> >> >*that point, you've really caught on to something fundamental here.*