

Re: Solar, not nuclear

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007-02/msg00009.html>

- *From:* dave.walters@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 1 Feb 2007 13:45:30 -0800
-

On Feb 1, 6:38 am, "bill" <ford_prefec...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

And why should anyone be content with
European scale efficiencies?
Improved lifestyles can be had at a third of
their energy consumption,

if not less.

Even if that were true then we would still need to double
Earth's energy
supply. Doubling supply through conservation is impossible;
we need new
clean energy sources.

Doubling through conservation is trivial. 80% of the work done in Europe
has no productive value. Europe's economy still produces and imports
products that are designed to fail, designed to be unserviceable once key
componetnts fail, etc.

Designing todays drill to be unserviceable when part x fails is
for efficiency, it's more energy efficient to replace the drill than it
is to keep a vast inventory of parts for failed obsolete drills. My
makita 9.6 volt lasted 12 years of contractor level use, that's pretty
efficient, I ran 10 times as much energy through the 4 replacement
batteries I bought for it during it's useful life as was involved in
manufacturing it.

Consider the example case of rechargeable drills. Every year manufacturers
release new models with a differently constructed battery pack such that the
old batteries no longer fit. The make them a little wider or a little
fatter, or a little deeper, or change the mounting clip or alter the
placement of key mounting slots or mounting posts.

Oh, you mean the case where the interface between the drill and
the battery pack is patented? the one where it would cost

Re: Solar, not nuclear

manufacturer x an exorbitant amount of money to use manufacturer Y's patented locking system? And incidentally the one where you can buy batteries for any drill ever manufactured from the original manufacturer? That case?

There is only reason why there needs to be more than 1 18 volt NiCad battery pack. They all operate the same, produce the same voltage, last the same length of time, etc. The reason is to force the consumer to purchase a new drill once their battery packs are spent, even if the old drill body itself is still functional.

Businesses regularly have their employees, destroy or render useless parts like chargers batteries, and other components. so that they can <NOT> be resold or used as replacements should a customer need such a replacement. Copier companies scraping older copiers are instructed to "render useless" any and all parts that may be used on still servicable machines so that customers are <FORCED> to purchase freshly manufactured parts at higher cost.

These are just to examples, of a technique used by corporations all over the world to force consumers to repurchase the products they have already purchased. Thus keeping the producer in business.

All this is endemic of the diseased communist mind that thinks that anything done by profit motivated corporations is evil and therefore inefficient, the "render useless all parts" is for EFFICIENCY moron, if you take a part that is still "good" out of dead copier X and put it in newer copier Y, then that part will fail before the bulk of the copier, you will need to send a repairman 20 miles in a car to fix it and the office will be without their copier for the day not to mention that there's a good chance that the shitty part you just put in will break other good parts around it when it goes. This creates greater inefficiencies than replacing the part with a newly manufactured one because manufacturing processes are SO ASTOUNDINGLY EFFICIENT.

Efficiency first. Renewables next, then supplement with nuclear and

oil as needed.

Supplement with oil? Increased use of fossil fuels is suicide.

Increase? Where do you see the word increase?

Oil and coal can continue to be used as a fuel but only at environmentally sustainable rates. Currently we are emitting about 9 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere each year. 1 gigatonne of emissions can be handled by the biosphere without any ongoing carbon accumulation.

Re: Solar, not nuclear

Global warming is upon us now, and it takes time to build significant new energy sources.

Exactly why it is folly to put the world on a path to building 250,000 new nuclear power plants.

moron, the 15000 reactors that are the real number for full fossil fuel replacement with a doubling of demand are the only way, your efficiency bullshit is exactly why nothing will be being done for the next 20 years and all those fossil fuels will be burned. thanks for poisoning the atmosphere with your lies. you support something that manifestly doesn't work, and use that lie to oppose something that manifestly does work, as a result of which the status quo is maintained. ask yourself which you prefer, nuclear or coal, because those are the only options in the real world.

This is true...although there is no need to replace ALL fossil plants, just the most polluting (coal) and the least efficient (old ones, of all sorts, nukes, gas/oil and coal). Realistically, and if done seriously, we would build 4,000 to 8,000 new Gen III and Gen III+ plants. This would allow for growth of demand AND retirement of some of the worst plants. This could be done over the next 30 years.

There really is only one problem with nuclear, which is sort of a "good" problem, and that's off-peak loading the plants. Unlike conventional steam plants, nukes need to run flat out 24/7 to work correctly. So...a good off-peak electrical sink for this much power is h2 generation. It's essentially "free" this way, and can be used to *eliminate* the use of natural gas in H2 production (NG is used 98% of the time now for H2 production and give's off CO2 for those that care). With increases in battery capacity and efficiency, overnight recharging of auto transport would become far more efficient.

David Walters

.