

Respondent Details	
Name:	Tom Blees, President
Organisation:	Science Council for Global Initiatives

<input type="checkbox"/>	Business representative organisation/trade body
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charity or social enterprise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large business ( over 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal representative
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade union or staff association
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe): International Science & Policy Think Tank

The consultation document sets out the Government's proposed approach to the longer term management of the UK's plutonium stocks for public scrutiny and consultation. Comments on any aspect of this issue are welcome, but the key questions posed in this consultation are:

No	Question
Q1	Do you agree that it is not realistic for the Government to wait until fast breeder reactor technology is commercially available before taking a decision on how to manage plutonium stocks?
Response	I strongly disagree, but this small space is insufficient to explain my reasoning. Therefore I have posted a response on a private web page that you can access at the following URL: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/3v2jcj4">http://tinyurl.com/3v2jcj4</a>
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	Certainly. The only question is whether sound judgement will be able to override salesmanship, vested interests, fear mongering, and political expediency based on shortsighted electoral interests. I would strongly encourage a heavy emphasis on scientific fact and reasoned analysis. You have some very gifted scientists available for consultation, such as David MacKay of Cambridge and Sir David King. MacKay, as you surely know, is Chief Scientific Advisor to the Department of Energy and Climate Change.
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?
Response	Yes, and the options discussed in Question 1 meet all those conditions.
Q4	Is the Government doing the right thing by taking a preliminary policy view and setting out a strategic direction in this area now?

Response	That is primarily a political question, since the safe storage of plutonium as practiced today is certainly workable for a number of decades at least. That said, developments in nuclear power technology make this a propitious time to take a decisive step forward in cooperation with other nations. What is seen as a liability can be transformed into a valuable asset.
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?
Response	See Question 1.
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	Many of the views expressed in this document seem to indicate a dismissal of good options and an acceptance of expensive and wasteful choices. Some seem to indicate a poor understanding of the relative merits and demerits of technologies such as MOX, as well as politically-inspired priorities leading away from rational scientific analysis. But then that's partly why you've solicited opinions like this, isn't it? For that, I applaud you. All the more if you'll act on sound reasoning in the end.
Q7	Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?
Response	Long-term disposal would be lamentable and foolhardy. The energy available in that plutonium is prodigious and can help solve both our climate and global energy problems.