"Worth Achieving At Any Cost"

The Times **claims** to have inside information that the Bush Administration is planning to "act to foment revolt" in Iran, in order to achieve regime change there without military action. A pre-emptive strike on Iran's nuclear-weapons manufacturing facilities is also allegedly mooted.

Of course, Iran vitriolically **denies** having any such facilities.

However, at at the end of the article, we find:

> Despite the US threats one of Iran's top ruling clerics vowed yesterday that the Islamic republic would continue to pursue its controversial nuclear programme. "We are resolute. It is worth achieving it at any cost," Ayatollah Ahmad Jannati, head of the Guardians Council, said.

Yes: increasing Iran's electricity supply by 1% outweighs any other national goal and is worth achieving at all costs.

That *is* what their nuclear programme is for, isn't it?

Sun, 07/18/2004 - 00:35 | **digg** | **del.icio.us** | **permalink**

1%?

Not that the figure sounds very far off, just curious where *The World* got its projection of 1% electricity increase. Is it a guess or a calculated value? Of course, even it was significantly more, its still not worth achieving "at all costs".

by a reader on Mon, 07/19/2004 - 20:27 | **reply**

Re: 1%

It was a pure guess.

A more accurate guess would be:

Iran's **annual electricity production**: 124.6 billion kWh (2001), which is equivalent to a power of about 14GW. The installed capacity must be at least that. Capacity of the **power station**

under construction: 1GW. So the proposed increase in capacity is

no more than 7%.

Close enough.

Re: 1%

Yes, but that's the wrong calculation.

If this was really about increasing electric power, you'd have to subtract from your 7% the electricity they would get by spending the same money on conventional power stations. So the net increase might be 1% after all. Or even negative.