

Nature and Nuclear

I believe in nature, that we are adapted to nature, and that the further afield we go from nature, the greater the risk there is of being unprepared for something that we are not adapted for, or can deal with well.

I do not think that what is the most “natural” is always necessarily the best option. I do believe in having an occasional “crutch”, and that progressing can mean the development of ways of incorporating things with nature, if done well.

In a way, everything we do is probably still within the bounds of “nature”, even when they seem like foreign materials or technology, but these are more extreme.

This “adaptive” theory is a bit of a personal philosophy that natural is best generally. Things that are “naturalised” have gone through some kind of process of incorporating with nature, settling into a kind of balance and proportionality.

I certainly trust this process much more than I trust people that purport to be “experts”. While I respect skills and knowledge, I do not think these people have any idea what they are doing in comparison to nature. Even the idea that they think they do is extremely alarming.

They are just so far out of their league. Scientists carefully accumulating knowledge and applying it is one thing, them thinking that they are better developed than, or can “improve” nature, is another.

Meddling with genes, for example, and thinking that they can cut and paste, trial and error, engineer future genetics, without understanding them, is not smart.

If people weren't puppets before, they would surely risk being made one to allow such activity to take place. Maybe they are not in control, and are somehow an afterthought for what is “allowed” to happen, a useful “tool” of nature. How do we avoid near misses when everyone has their hand on the button?

It's like letting a toddler rebuild your plane's engine. Yet they go full steam ahead, as if nothing bad could happen. I don't think we should rely on that being true. Perhaps they expect nature to incorporate it for them. We would not want to overwhelm nature past the point of unfeasibility.

There could come a time when understanding could become so nuanced, that it would allow for truly informed, naturalised expertise, but I just don't think that's where we're at. I can't be the only person that thinks this.

When it comes to nuclear, my opinion is that it is too far afield, based on the highly technical way the technology exists, and the extremely negative effects of radiation exposure if the worst happens.

When it comes to risk, I do not believe you should bet more than you are willing to lose, or more than you can handle if it goes wrong, if you can help it. I do not think that a high amount of risk with a “low probability” is a good choice. We are firm on this issue and it should probably stay that way.

We get to choose the foundations we build upon, and what we choose to rely upon. It makes sense to draw a line with the type of risk that we build our very future upon.