

Re: OT: Nuclear Waste (Was Re-Marketing Ada)

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Ada/comp.lang.ada/2003-11/0792.html>

From: Dmytry Lavrov (dmytrylavrov_at_fsmail.net)

Date: 11/19/03

Date: 19 Nov 2003 07:28:55 -0800

18k11tm001@sneakemail.com (Russ) wrote in message
news:<bebbba07.0311182136.51a828b6@posting.google.com>...
> "Robert I. Eachus" <rieachus@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<_eydnYB-uYJw1yeiRVn-vg@comcast.com>...

>
>> *The other blatant lie is worse. Right now a significant amount of the
>> radiation dose you receive every year comes from coal burning power
>> plants! Huh? Yep. Burning coal releases a large amount of radioactive
>> material into the environment.*

Are everyone who think so complete dumbs or idiots or what?It's NOT
increases radioactivity on planet surface or anywhere.Like saying that
golfstream produces radioactivity because there's lots of uranium and
other isotopes in water moved by it.

Nuclear plant also not increases radioactivity for infinite time,it
increases radioactivity for "short" time of several thousands of
years.

Assume we have isotope with halflife of 50 years.Uranium half-life is
 $5 \cdot 10^9$ years.That waste is 10^8 times more radioactive.To fall to
uranium level,more than 24 half-life periods must pass($2^3=8$,bit
lesser than 10).It's 1200 years.

Other isotope of 500 years are 1^7 times more radioactive and need 21
half-lives,10_000 years to reach uranium level.

>> *Some gases from things like radon gas
>> otherwise trapped in the coal beds, and other solid radiation sources
>> like potassium-40 that is in the fly ash, concentrated by plants in
>> areas where the fly ash eventually settles and then found in the food
>> supply. In other words, the amount of radioactivity released into the
>> environment by the nuclear fuel cycle for a given nuclear plant is
>> measured in milligrams per year. The radioactive material released by by
>> a coal burning plant is measured in tons per year. (And yes, I know the
>> difference between high-level and low-level nuclear wastes, and most of
>> the radioactive material released when coal is burned is low-level. But
>> the same holds with nuclear reactors--the high-level wastes are
>> concentrated in the fuel rods, and most of the radiation sources*

- > > *released are low level.*)
- >
- > *That's what is really amazing about this whole supposed "debate." I*
- > *can point out that the air pollution from coal-fired is four or five*
- > *orders of magnitude more dangerous than radioactive nuclear waste, but*
- > *that would be only part of the story. The simple fact is that, per*
- > *unit of energy produced, the radioactivity in the *coal* waste is*
- > *greater than the radioactivity in the *nuclear* waste.*

Only idiots think so. Many peoples died after Chernobyl, and that was relatively small plant, only one reactor have been melted, and only several precents of isotopes was spreaded in the gaseous form, wind moved in opposite direction to town (forest was die at direction of wind, even that plants are quite resistant, many times more resistant than humans). Strange, but peoples that like += also like radioactivity. Should be correlation... mutation....

- > *It's just more*
- > *concentrated in the nuclear waste -- but that's an advantage, because*
- > *that makes it much easier to manage. (Think of having trash*
- > *concentrated in cans rather than scattered all over the landscape.)*
- >
- > *Yet people continue to fall for the old cliché' that "nuclear waste is*
- > *dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years." The sheer ignorance of*
- > *people who parrot this one has always amazed me. First of all,*
- > *chemical waste isn't dangerous for just "hundreds of thousands of*
- > *years," it is dangerous *forever*. It has an *infinite* halflife.*

Not. It have relatively small halflife. Biologically dangerous _molecular_ waste should react with biopolymers, that's happen and bacteria could clean that waste relatively fast, there's no exponential halflife. When dangerous elements (like lead) are spreaded, it again does not increase concentration on surface.

- > A
- > *long halflife means weak radioactive emissions. In fact, the toxicity*
- > *of long-lived radioisotopes is essentially chemical.*

Not. Get some uranium, put into capsule, and fix on ..one well known point on your body...

- >
- > > *Hmmm. Let me put it this way instead. There was an analysis done many*
- > > *years ago*
- > > *known as the Wash1400 report if I remember correctly. (Yep:*
- > > *http://stellar-one.com/nuclear/staff_reports/summary_WASH1400.htm) It*
- > > *analyzed the number of deaths to be expected from a "maximum credible"*
- > > *nuclear power plant accident that came very close to matching the Three*
- > > *Mile Island disaster a few years later. Total deaths from radiation*
- > > *released by the initial failure? Less than 100, how much less is*
- > > *irrelevant. Because the report correctly predicted that the deaths due*
- > > *to restarting older coal burning plants to replace the power lost when*

- > > *the reactor failed would be in the thousands--per year. And that is*
- > > *what happened at TMI.*
- >
- > *That study and others have found that a nuclear meltdown would have to*
- > *occur every two weeks to equal the damage done by the *routine**
- > *emissions from coal-fired power.*

Please reply to _that_:

Nuclear bomb are equivalent to several kg's of waste. Do you want nuclear war?

Or for you there's no difference between nuclear war and non-radioactive weapons because they works like coal-fired power?

Many peoples die due to several microgramms of waste they got after Chirosima,or what,not?!?!?!?

Are we again need small nuclear war to become more-or-less careful?