

Additional Review By M. D. Campbell and Associates, L.P.
(<http://www.mdcampbell.com>)

Key to Comments:
Black = Original Article Content
Yellow = Particular Offending words or phrases
Red = C&A Mining Group Comments

Article in Question:

Don't Be Fooled by Nuclear Industry Shill; Environmentalists Are Not Backing New Reactors

Nuclear Power Plant Proposed for Victoria Puts Region at Risk

By "admin", from American Patriots.com - May 9th, 2008

May 8, 2008 -- AUSTIN, Texas – While an environmental consultant brought to Victoria to tout nuclear energy is quick to claim that a new reactor proposed for the area would be “clean and safe,” he is less likely to discuss today at a private gathering of business and community leaders his ties to the industry, which is sponsoring his speaking tour. Since 2006, Patrick Moore has been a paid spokesperson for the nuclear industry. He is co-chair of the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition, which is wholly funded by the nuclear industry lobby group, the Nuclear Energy Institute.

[Mr. Moore apparently decided nuclear power is the way to go so he went to work to help develop the energy source. So what does he claim? The anonymous reporter either didn't ask or isn't allowing the reader to know this.]

“While Moore wants people to believe that talking points crafted by the nuclear industry are the prevailing position of the environmental community, the fact is no major environmental organization promotes the expansion of nuclear power as a solution to global warming,” said Tom “Smitty” Smith, director of Public Citizen’s Texas office. “The facts remain: Nuclear power is dangerous, environmentally malignant and an uneconomical energy source.”

[General unspecified claims quoted by a person paid by an adversarial group formed to oppose nuclear power and related issues. What specifically does Mr. Smith claim that Mr. Moore wants people to believe?. Mr. Smith uses the term “fact” to legitimize claims that have no basis provided. Generalized opposition to nuclear power without providing reasons for the opinion clearly shows that adversarial groups with righteous-sounding names like *Public Citizen* have nothing to offer the general public but fear. Using such terms as

“dangerous” and “environmentally malignant” to characterize an operating nuclear power plant is not only fear-mongering at its worst, but a misrepresentation of the facts: more than 100 such plants have been operating in the U.S. for more than 25 year without a single death related to radiation or without a single incident that affected the environment to any serious degree. There are more than 400 such plants operating in the world with similar records in countries with far less focus on human health and the environment than in the U.S. These safety records should eliminate public fear of using nuclear power. Mr. Smith’s claim that nuclear power is an “uneconomical energy source” makes us wonder if Smith only reads his own propaganda and ignores reality. The economics of nuclear power has been established for many years. If Smith ever had a course in economics, he would know that the costs to construct and the cost to handle the waste are factored into the overall cost of electrical generation by nuclear power. See C&A Review # 17:

<http://mdcampbell.com/CARReviewszz/Australian112407.pdf>

However, in a free society, even kooks are permitted and even encouraged by the local press to express their concerns, even if they have no rational basis to their concerns. Only in America!]

The Victoria Economic Development Corporation, which is hosting Moore’s presentation, has billed the event as a discussion on energy issues in Texas and the environmental benefits of nuclear power generation. The talk follows the announcement by Illinois-based utility Exelon Nuclear that it wants to build a new reactor in the area, breaking from the industry’s usual strategy of choosing sites where reactors already exist and where opposition is less likely.

“The failure of both the Victoria Economic Development Corporation and Moore to disclose his relationship with the nuclear industry is blatantly deceptive,” Smith said.

[Let’s look at what was stated and presented before we call Mr. Moore “blatantly deceptive”. Maybe Mr. Moore should have been asked by the anonymous reporter of this article about the relationship to show that the article is fairly balanced reporting and not biased reporting.]

The arguments against nuclear power are overwhelming, Smith said. Nuclear plants face safety shortcomings and lack protection from terrorist attacks. Nuclear power is not a clean energy source, producing low- and high-level radioactive waste at every step of the process – from uranium mining to energy production. That waste will remain dangerously radioactive for tens of thousands of years. Then there is the more than \$13 billion a year in taxpayer

subsidies the industry receives. In fact, without huge subsidies, nuclear power companies would close their doors, Smith said.

[The reader should note here that the above quotations from Smith allows the reporter to roll out the rest of Smith's tired fare of baseless accusations against nuclear power:

1) Nuclear power plants have a safety record better than any heavy industry in the U.S. Smith's claims are untrue.

2) Nuclear power plants have been built and are operated to resist terrorist attacks. Has the reader ever tried to get into such a plant? The plant's domes protecting the reactors are designed to protect them from even a direct hit from large planes. That is why construction costs are high and the plants require time to be built. They are fortresses. Smith's claims are untrue

3) Of course the plants produce wastes but these are being handled by the industry until sites are built to store the waste for later recycling. Has the reader ever heard of radioactive wastes produced by operating plants causing serious problems anywhere in the U.S. over the past 30 years? The answer is no, aside from a few incidents of very minor leaks on the plant site, including the Three Mile Island incident, which created no damage to human health and the environment. Although there have been some problems with some of the very old nuclear processing centers – Hanford, Fernold, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, for example. However, these problems were non-radioactive problems.

4) The plants today produce extremely low levels of CO₂ or other emissions compared to other energy sources. Claims that uranium exploration and in situ recovery of uranium cause lasting radiation issues for the surrounding residents have no basis in fact. This is because the State and Federal regulatory agencies have the responsibility to see that it doesn't affect human health and the environment. If residences have no faith in the regulatory agencies then they have lost their faith in the American system and are no longer American patriots. Once again Smith's claims are untrue and we call into question his faith and patriotism!

5) Providing subsidies are our government's way of supporting industry by your taxes. Farmer's, bio-diesel, and the wind- and solar-power industries are all receiving huge subsidies to allow for leveling of costs when compared to nuclear power and even coal and fuel oil. Once again Smith's claims are grossly exaggerated.]

Residents and decision-makers in Victoria should demand a balanced examination of nuclear technology and the impacts it would have on their community, not a distorted view of nuclear power served up by an industry spokesperson at a meeting closed to the public, said Sandra McKenzie, a local Victoria attorney.

[Once again, a new voice from a biased source is quoted as an authority. This source ignores the role that State and Federal regulatory agencies play in nuclear power development ranging from uranium exploration to uranium recovery. This balanced examination of nuclear technology and its impact on the community is discussed in the environmental impact statements and other permit applications that are required by State and Federal laws. The local Victoria attorney quoted above is spinning up business for her practice by praying on local residents and their fears of radioactivity, nuclear power and NIMBY reactions.]

“Before allowing an industry to make such a huge change in our way of life, the citizens of this community deserve an opportunity to have all of our questions and concerns addressed,” McKenzie said. “A closed forum does not allow for the type of dialogue that Victoria needs to engage in before making a decision on an issue that will change the face of our community for generations to come.”

[The Plaintiff attorney continues her diatribe by suggesting that all relevant questions are not being asked by the regulatory agencies, whose job it is to represent the all Texans. Certainly the attorney is aware that public hearings will be conducted before a building or operating permit will be granted by the State or the Federal authorities. The attorney is pandering to her small group of citizens that do not trust the state to represent them, perhaps in hopes of filing suits against anyone so as to funnel the residents’ money into the pockets of the Plaintiff attorneys. It is remarkable how they appear in such matters, not unlike well-know ambulance chasers. These attorneys follow a similar script: Scare the residents into paying for baseless lawsuits where only the Plaintiff attorneys win. Only in America!]

Moore’s claim of being an environmentalist is based on his work with Greenpeace in the early 1970s. But since the early 1990s, Moore has worked as a corporate consultant for groups looking to put an environmental spin on such things as genetically modified crops, PVCs and how to dispose of toxic mining byproducts.

[The reader has to decide whose spin does has merit. What evidence do they present. Who has a bias and is that bias overriding the truth in the matter? The reporter closes by repeating claims of Mr. Moore’s bias without asking why Mr. Moore changed his view of nuclear power. Mr. Moore has made numerous public statements why, but none of those

appear in this article. Maybe his arguments have merit. Neither the un-named reporter nor Smith of *Public Citizen* seem to consider only their own worn-out and poorly supported diatribe. Why have other products that have provided so much good been discussed at the end of the article? Genetically modified crops that produce more food; PVCs (actually PVC pipes) do not rust and are widely used in water and irrigation pipes, and are among other plastic products that are needed in society today. The biased reporting should become obvious to the reader. Fortunately, these issues, as well as others involving uranium exploration and nuclear power development in general, are now being discussed in the light of reason without fear (see: <http://www.assuranceonline.us/articles.html>), and especially a recent review of Goliad issues by the industry-sponsored group, *Assurance OnLine* ([here](#)). We have reviewed the latter and have determined that it has merit and is well founded.]

Original Article:

http://www.allamericanpatriots.com/48747138_don%E2%80%99t-be-fooled-nuclear-industry-shill-environment

XXX