

Re: Space station future adrift (Soyuz purchase crisis)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-12/1056.html>

From: rk (*stellare_at_nospamplease.comcast.net*)

Date: 11/28/04

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 2004 11:51:12 -0600

John Doe wrote:

> *Revision wrote:*

>> *The Iranians aren't helping things at all on this front. While they
>> have apparently given some sort of agreement not to produce
>> weapons-grade uranium, they still operate a 40 MW plutonium production
>> reactor.*

>

>

> *Tyere are a great many countries that have nuclear reactors and
> programmes. The USA is far from having some sort of monopoly on this.
> Brasil refuses IAEA inspectors in some of its facilities, claiming it has
> proprietary technology. Yet, you don't hear the USA threathetning to
> invade Brasil. Canad has developped its own nuclear technology, very
> different from the proprietary USA nukular technology. When Edison
> invented electricity, he had a monopoly on how to generate it. But today,
> every country in the world knows how to make it. Same for nuclear. It
> isn't some black magic.*

Your attempt to equate electric power generating technology (Edison) with nuclear technology is of course false and intellectually dishonest.

> *If the USA is so worried about nukes in the middle east, perhaps it
> shoudl start with its own 51st state: Isreal. Everyone known it has the
> bomb, yet Isarel refuses to admit to it, yet you don't see the USA making
> such a big fuss about IAEA inspectors not being allowed to do their job
> in Isarel.*

The USA and many other nations are worried about nukes in the hands of Iran with its current leadership. You can create your false strawman if you want but that's Just Fantasy, Mezei.

> *Yet, the USA treats neighbours in the region very differently.*

That's appropriate since countries in that region are very different.

sci.space.policy: Re: Space station future adrift (Soyuz purchase crisis)

- > *And when*
- > *you send a strong message that you will invade any weak country like*
- > *Iraq, but not invade countries that have the bomb, you are giving a very*
- > *strong incentive for those countries to get the bomb, especially if you*
- > *were stupid enough to list those countries as your next target for your*
- > *campaign of whatever. (axis of evil).*

You conveniently neglect to mention such facts as Iran working on obtaining such weapons and the means to deliver them prior to words being spoken in an address.

Iraq was not a weak country.

Of course, Iran is also developing longer and longer range missiles.

And Iran has as policy the elimination of Israel and the Jews there, as do others in that neck of the woods who will not even establish diplomatic relations. But all this seems consistent with your policy, too.

- > *If you go back to the end of the Shah, you will find that it was the USA*
- > *which convinced Iraq to embark on a nuclear programme to generate*
- > *electricity beyond the days where oil was sufficient.*
- >
- > *The trade sanctions against Russia are just plain silly. If it had been*
- > *Britain that had sold its nuclear systems to Iran, the USA wouldn't have*
- > *put such sanctions against the UK.*

That's Just Fantasy, Mezei. Britain did not sell its nuclear system to Iran.

--
rk, Just an OldEngineer
"Engineers abhor extrapolation"
-- Ken Iliff, from *_Runway to Orbit_*, 2004