



GeoffRussell

Posted Thursday, February 26, 2015 - 17:38

I'm having difficulty with your logic Scott. You claim that we can't roll out nuclear fast enough. That may certainly be true. But the costs will be determined by the response of people like yourself. If you drag every nuclear project through the courts as has been done for decades then it will be expensive and slow, but if you bite your lip and let the engineers get on with it, it can be much, much cheaper than it is presently. The Chinese and the South Koreans are building nukes very cheaply. We aren't all mesmerised by branded US iNukes ... we want stuff that works. But suppose we are too late and that nuclear won't be fast enough, then the history is clear that nuclear is much faster than wind + solar, so what should be do? Nuclear is too slow so lets go with something slower? That's your logic.

See page 75 in this document and compare the lines for France and Germany.

<http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/CO2EmissionsFromFuelCombustionHighlights2014.pdf>

France went from 65 to 42 tonnes of CO2 per terrajoule between 1971 and 1985.

Compare Germany went from 58.6 to 57.7 tonnes of CO2 per terra joule between 2000 and 2012 ... not quite 15 years ... So over 14 years France dropped by 23 tonnes of CO2 per terrajoule while Germany dropped 0.9 in 12.

Which is bigger Scott 23 or 0.9?

So I repeat your logic is, "Nuclear is too slow, so lets go with something MUCH SLOWER".

This isn't some kind of game, it's serious and we need people to be rational.

<https://newmatilda.com/2015/02/26/nuclear-industry-trial-scott-ludlam-hopes-so#comments>