

Chem power

The Urth list — 8 messages, 6 voices, 08 Sep 2002

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/3452>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Roy C. Lackey — 08 Sep 2002, 21:37

Dan'I wrote:

Noooo ... their power source is clearly nucyulehr. Isotopes everywhere when a chem blows. That won't work.

Correct:

"Five chains away, the blade of the azoth wrecked a fusion generator, and the soldier whose heart it had been died." (LS3, 9)

But, but . . . that's just another good reason to shoot those fool engineers who designed them! If chems were subject to exploding and raining radioactive material all around when they died, then they were a hazard to every bio around them, including their fellow human troopers. Dumb. But then, Typhon didn't care about people, did he?

-Roy

Bratt Ian — 09 Sep 2002, 03:15 · follows Roy C. Lackey

On Sun, 8 Sep 2002, Roy C. Lackey wrote:

"Five chains away, the blade of the azoth wrecked a fusion generator, and the soldier whose heart it had been died." (LS3, 9)

But, but . . . that's just another good reason to shoot those fool engineers who designed them! If chems were subject to exploding and raining radioactive material all around when they died, then they were a hazard to every bio around them, including their fellow human troopers. Dumb. But then, Typhon didn't care about people, did he?

-Roy

A quick technical point: Roy, you seem to be confusing fission and fusion. Fission, what powers modern power plants, is the process of massive nuclei breaking apart and releasing energy. Radioactivity is a natural byproduct of this process. Fusion, however, is the process of lighter nuclei fusing together to make a more massive nuclei. Large amounts of energy are released during fusion, but with significantly less radioactive emissions (on order of 10^9 less than fission).

http://wwwofe.er.doe.gov/More_HTML/Comparison_w_fission.GIF

Unfortunately for society, commercially available fusion generators are still science fiction. I don't think those "fool engineers" would appreciate you being so trigger happy :)

Cheers,
Ian

Andy Robertson — 09 Sep 2002, 04:38 · follows Bratt Ian

But:: Fusion would create a neutron flux which would turn many of the ordinary elements the generator was composed of into radioactive isotopes. Particularly if the generator had been running for hundreds of years.

Another reason why I doubt Hyacinth was a chem or a chem with a bio shell - the radiation would be bad for living flesh actually in contact with the chem, though it is short range and would not hurt people in the same room (much).

hartshorn

----- Original Message ----- eutron flux

From: "Bratt Ian" <Ian.Bratt at Colorado.EDU>
To: "urth" <urth at urth.net>
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 4:15 AM
Subject: Re: (urth) Chem power

On Sun, 8 Sep 2002, Roy C. Lackey wrote:

"Five chains away, the blade of the azoth wrecked a fusion generator,
and the soldier whose heart it had been died." (LS3, 9)

But, but . . . that's just another good reason to shoot those fool engineers who designed them! If chems were subject to exploding and raining radioactive material all around when they died, then they were a hazard to every bio around them, including their fellow human troopers. Dumb. But then, Typhon didn't care about people, did he?

-Roy

A quick technical point: Roy, you seem to be confusing fission and fusion. Fission, what powers modern power plants, is the process of massive nuclei breaking apart and releasing energy. Radioactivity is a natural byproduct of this process. Fusion, however, is the process of lighter nuclei fusing together to make a more massive nuclei. Large amounts of energy are released during fusion, but with significantly less radioactive emissions (on order of 10^9 less than fission).

http://www.foe.er.doe.gov/More_HTML/Comparison_w_fission.GIF

Unfortunately for society, commercially available fusion generators are still science fiction. I don't think those "fool engineers" would appreciate you being so trigger happy :)

Cheers,
Ian

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 09 Sep 2002, 16:00 · follows Andy Robertson

But:: Fusion would create a neutron flux which would turn many of the ordinary elements the generator was composed of into radioactive isotopes.

Not if you reverse the polarity on the neutrino flow.

Yours for better technobabble,

Michael Straight — 09 Sep 2002, 16:16 · follows Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

On Mon, 9 Sep 2002, Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

But:: Fusion would create a neutron flux which would turn many of the ordinary elements the generator was composed of into radioactive isotopes.

Not if you reverse the polarity on the neutrino flow.

Yes, exactly. If we can assume the chem-makers have figured out how to put a fusion generator in a robot, we can probably assume they figured out how to solve the radioactivity problem too unless someone finds some textual evidence that they are radioactive (Aha! The true source of Silk's mutant powers! He was raised by radioactive robots!)

-Rostrum

matthew.malthouse — 09 Sep 2002, 16:11 · follows Michael Straight

On 09/09/2002 17:00:35 Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

But:: Fusion would create a neutron flux which would turn many of the ordinary elements the generator was composed of into radioactive isotopes.

Not if you reverse the polarity on the neutrino flow.

Only possible if your sonic screwdriver has the special attachment

Matthew

Andy Robertson — 09 Sep 2002, 13:58 · follows matthew.malthouse

Yes, even then. You cannae break the laws of physics, captain, etc etc.

hartshorn

----- Original Message -----

From: "Dan'I Danehy-Oakes" <ddanehy at siebel.com>

To: <urth at urth.net>

Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 5:00 PM

Subject: RE: (urth) Chem power

But:: Fusion would create a neutron flux which would turn many of the ordinary elements the generator was composed of into radioactive isotopes.

Not if you reverse the polarity on the neutrino flow.

Yours for better technobabble,

--Blattid

--

Roy C. Lackey — 09 Sep 2002, 17:43 · follows Andy Robertson

Ian writes:

A quick technical point: Roy, you seem to be confusing fission and fusion. Fission, what powers modern power plants, is the process of massive nuclei breaking apart and releasing energy. Radioactivity is a natural byproduct of this process. Fusion, however, is the process of lighter nuclei fusing together to make a more massive nuclei. Large amounts of energy are released during fusion, but with significantly less radioactive emissions (on order of 10^9 less than fission).

Yes, and that's all very well when the fusion chamber remains intact; but when it is breached? When the plasma hits the fan, so to speak, what then? Why was Dr. Crane, when he and Silk were pulled from the lake, concerned to say:

"But we've gotten a thorough washing, and that's good. Lots of isotopes released when a chem blows." (LS2, 13)

I hadn't supposed that when chems exploded it was comparable, in any way, to a present-day nuclear device exploding; had it been, Crane and Silk would have died in the room where and when Lemur did, and isotopes would never have been an issue.

-Roy