Anti-Nuclear Spokesman Fudges Facts

June 20 — An interview with Theodore Taylor of the Princeton University Program on Nuclear Policy Alternatives has revealed the latest twist in the Carter Administration's anti-energy policy: Taylor called for the development of the thorium breeder reactor — *since it doesn't work* and will help justify the implementation of vastly more inefficient solar energy.

In an Op-Ed in the New York Times earlier this year, Taylor claimed that the thorium cycle breeder is relatively free from the "dangers inherent in the plutonium cycle." Specifically, terrorists would find it more difficult to manufacture a bomb from the thorium cycle's U-233.

Since thorium reactors probably won't even breed, or will do so only marginally, they would have little or no effect on the need for reactor fuel. In addition, the most feasible way to produce the U-233 fuel is to use the neutrons from a reactor using plutonium, so why not just produce plutonium in the first place.

In response to questions on the drawbacks of the thorium breeder, versus the vitally needed fast breeder, Taylor pointed out that he expects solar energy to be implemented soon, so that the long-term fuel solution provided by the fast breeder is not really necessary.

Taylor suggests, "We should get rid of all the plutonium by creating U-233. I won't say it is the most toxic substance in the world, but it is very, very bad." As for fusion energy, "You know that the fusion reaction is the same as the H-bomb. Since the technologies are related, there could be spill over from fusion to bomb building."

Within 50 years, Taylor says, about one percent of the earth's land mass can be covered with solar collectors. Taylor neglected to mention that the sun is also "the same as the H-bomb," and that solar collectors are just the most expensive and inefficient way of harnessing a fusion reaction.

Design Breakthrough Of Internal Combustion Engines Stymied

At least three devices or processes which would result in large savings of fuel are being kept from both public knowledge and development by industry and government agencies. This is no old chestnut about dropping a pill in a tank of water to turn it into gasoline — these are proven systems. One of these processes involves additives to petroleum which increase its efficiency by 25 to 30 percent in actual industrial tests.

This publication has previously described novel methods of desalination and iron ore reduction that would almost immediately save quadrillions of BTUs, freeing the energy for expansion of the economy, while at the same time doubling food and steel production and providing desperately needed water. The inventors of these processes have resisted enormous pressure to maintain a commitment to the implementation of their systems. The story of the isolated inventor of the additive in question and his process can serve as a demonstration of the manner of control used by the hypocritical individuals hiding and destroying new technologies while preaching energy conservation.

The people involved in the production and testing of this process have asked to remain anonymous for the present and therefore the documentation and testimony concerning this material cannot be published here. A later report will present the evidence in a much more detailed way.

The process was discovered almost by accident in internal combustion engines. After extensive although not well-documented scientifically monitored tests demonstrated a very large saving in gasoline mileage, the inventor observed the effect in a continous hydrocarbon flame. This led to the testing in external combustion engines where the results were more dramatic and more easily monitored and controlled.

According to the inventor, the process requires an additive to increase the heat of the reaction in the flame and another component to keep the energy release from becoming excessive. The proper combination requires a high degree of experience with the process for proper and safe operation. This is especially true since so far there is no satisfactory scientific explanation of how the energy output is increased.

When improvements and further testing convinced the inventor that his process was effective and viable, he rather naively tried to demonstrate and market the system quickly. As in the case of the desalination and steel production processes, he soon found that the effectiveness of the process itself represented an excuse for not using it. The best-documented test reported the savings being "limited" to 25-30 percent, limited only by the strength of the material of the fire box. This was given as a reason for not using the process. Savings have been much higher in less documented tests.

The reasons given for not helping to develop and test the fuel additive sound like the reasons a buggy manufacturer might have given for not using a modern automobile engine. Even if it didn't run over the poor