

Re: "The Chernobyl disaster very probably a sabotage" ["no, just same procedure as last year"]

## Re: "The Chernobyl disaster very probably a sabotage" ["no, just same procedure as last year"]

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007-09/msg00098.html>

---

- *From:* [rolf.martens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:rolf.martens@xxxxxxxx) (Rolf Martens)
  - *Date:* Tue, 18 Sep 2007 04:30:32 GMT
- 

In article <[0MFHi.6148\\$A72.3702@trnddc08](mailto:0MFHi.6148$A72.3702@trnddc08)>, notmyname@xxxxxxxxxxxx says...

Bill Ward wrote:

On Mon, 17 Sep 2007 18:45:57 -0400, daestrom wrote:

"Rolf Martens" <[rolf.martens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:rolf.martens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:2UmHi.8954\\$ZA.4705@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:2UmHi.8954$ZA.4705@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

<snip>

What you're saying here is, that what took place at Chernobyl on 26.04.1986 was just "the same procedure as last year". "Such tests, with disabling of several safety systems, was the rule in the Soviet Union at that time."

No, very clearly it was not "just the same procedure" – which would have been a pretty risky thing too, even considering the well-known sloppy procedures in that social-imperialist state at the time.

....

Thanks, daestrom, for another incredibly interesting and informative post.

When do you think was the last point of safe return? It seems like once the rods were pulled outside the design limits, there was no way out. Was there any way to shut down the reactor other than suddenly reinserting the control rods? Could a slower insertion rate (before the final power

Re: "The Chernobyl disaster very probably a sabotage" ["no, just same procedure as last year"]

transient) have recovered from the situation?

The point of no return was probably when they tripped the second turbine for the test (the unit had two turbine generators). At that point the steam pressure started rising and the water flow started decreasing (because half of the water pumps operated off of the turbine that just tripped). The displacement of water in the reactor by steam caused a rapid rise in reactivity due to the positive void coefficient (steam absorbs fewer neutrons than liquid water). The power increased from 200 Mw to 530 Mw in less than three seconds. The operator responded by scrambling the reactor, but that just initiated a greater excursion for the reasons explained by daestrom.

I on my part am pretty certain that the point of no return was not one reached on account of any technical matter but on account of a political one, on account of some crooks' – and I've indicated as main suspects approximately the same as the French–language very well–informed blogger I quoted did too: The Gorbachov group and/or some of its US imperialist friends – deciding: "Let's pull it!".

See that "UNITE! Info #258en" of mine about the political context, and also the French–language blog "le petrole abiotique", article of 11.09.2007.

Rolf M.  
[www.rolf-martens.com](http://www.rolf-martens.com)

.