Wed, Apr 1 at 8:32 AM

Dear Mr. Drennan, Corporate Enforcement Authority,

Regarding the Irish Times article today, Independent consultant hired by corporate watchdog was recommended by its CEO – The Irish Times

all I can say is, thank you!

You keep giving me more and more material and opportunity, thanks to the IT, to corroborate all that I've alleged about you in terms of how compromised the CEA is.

Such practice by you certainly supports the allegations I made about the CEA, the body you preside over, some years ago.

Thank you again!

I'll add this email to my Opportunity Ireland section on Failte 32 in the March comments.

Yours,
Maurice D. Landers

Thu, Apr 2 at 8:42 AM

To: Opinion Editor

Dear Opinion Editor,

I hope you're well. I'm writing to submit an op-ed for your consideration titled "Microreactors: A Safe First Step Ireland Should Consider."

The piece is approximately 1,445 words and explores whether Ireland should evaluate microreactors as a small-scale, low-risk way to build domestic expertise in advanced nuclear technologies.

Given the ongoing national conversation around energy security, emissions, and grid resilience, I believe the topic is timely and relevant to your readers.

I'm very happy to revise or shorten the piece to suit your preferred length or format, or please feel free to shorten it yourself.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please let me know if you need anything further from me.

Kind regards, Maurice D. Landers

Microreactors: A Safe First Step Ireland Should Consider

Ireland is heading into an energy crunch that no amount of wishful thinking will solve. Electricity demand is projected to rise by 30–50 per cent this decade, driven by data centres, electrification, and population growth. Gas still supplies over half of our electricity. Our grid is strained, our emissions remain high, and our dependence on imported fuel leaves us exposed.

Yet one option remains taboo — not because of evidence, but because of memory.

For most people, "nuclear" still means vast concrete domes, cooling towers, and Cold War-era disasters. But the nuclear technologies emerging today bear little resemblance to the reactors that shaped public imagination. Some of the most promising designs are not large at all. They are microreactors — small, sealed, factory-built units closer in scale to a generator than a power station.

Before going further, I should say why I care about this. I write not as an armchair commentator but as someone who has spent his career supporting Ireland at home and abroad. Just out of the University of Limerick, I worked as a safety-test engineer in the UK, testing consumer products and authoring the reports that determined whether they were safe to reach the market — work that grounded me early in the discipline of risk assessment and regulatory responsibility.

After returning to Ireland, I became Leybold's representative on the island and worked to raise the company's profile. As part of that role, I demonstrated Leybold's leak-detection technology in a range of real-world settings — including a helium-leak test at a Midlands peat-fired station in the early 1990s. Even then, in a non-nuclear plant, safety was treated as paramount and advanced diagnostic tools were standard practice. The core architecture behind the system I used — a dry vacuum pump paired with a turbomolecular pump — remains industry-standard today.

That experience reinforced something important: Ireland has long applied high-end engineering and rigorous safety culture even in conventional energy facilities. It also gives me confidence that we could apply the same discipline to any new technology we choose to explore. Ireland is not starting from zero. We have deep expertise in our engineering community, including through the Irish Academy of Engineering and figures such as Dr Ed Walsh, widely admired for his substantial and well-documented background in nuclear engineering. The knowledge and experience already present in Ireland would allow us to approach emerging nuclear technologies with competence, caution, and confidence.

Since later moving to the United States, I've helped Irish professionals secure opportunities here and worked to bring investment and operations back to Ireland. I love my country and want to see it succeed, and I would never advocate for anything that could harm it. My interest in microreactors comes from that same place: a desire to see Ireland explore new options safely, responsibly, and on our own terms.

A microreactor typically produces 5–20 megawatts of power. It arrives on a truck, sits on a concrete pad, uses little or no water, and can run for years without refuelling. Many designs use meltdown-proof fuels such as TRISO, which remain stable at temperatures far beyond any conceivable accident scenario. They operate at atmospheric pressure, eliminating the risk of pressure-driven explosions. And they contain a fraction of one per cent of the radioactive material found in traditional reactors.

In other words, they are not "nuclear plants." They are nuclear appliances.

And here is the part that rarely enters the Irish conversation: the physics simply do not allow for a Chernobyl-style event. The fuel cannot melt. The reaction cannot run away. The worst-case scenarios are

orders of magnitude smaller than the public has been taught to fear. In practical terms, the risks associated with modern microreactors are comparable to — and in some respects lower than — the risks we already accept from gas or diesel generators used across the country today.

Yet Ireland's laws treat all nuclear technologies — from a 1,600-megawatt plant to a 10-megawatt microreactor — as if they are the same. They are not.

This is why a microreactor pilot makes sense. It is a modest, reversible step that would allow Ireland to test a small, advanced, tightly controlled unit for a specific purpose: powering a critical facility, supporting emergency infrastructure, or providing resilience for a data-dependent economy.

A pilot does not require a full nuclear ecosystem. It requires:

- a narrow piece of enabling legislation
- a focused regulatory unit
- one or two demonstration sites
- clear oversight and public transparency

That is far easier — and far faster — than attempting to design a full framework for large reactors from scratch.

And Ireland would not be going first. The US Department of Defense is already deploying microreactors for base resilience. Canada has a dedicated licensing pathway for them. Finland is evaluating microreactors for district heating. Even NASA is developing microreactors for lunar bases — the same class of systems that underpin the Artemis programme. These are not speculative technologies; they are real, funded, and advancing. If these systems are trusted for deep-space missions, it is reasonable for Ireland at least to examine them on Earth. Artemis II is a reminder that engineering evolves, safety advances, and assumptions deserve to be revisited.

More importantly, a pilot turns nuclear from an abstraction into an experience. People can see the scale for themselves. Engineers and regulators can build real expertise. Policymakers can evaluate modern nuclear technology based on Irish evidence, not inherited fears.

This shift — from ideology to experience — is what unlocks real options.

And while microreactors are not the solution to Ireland's grid-scale challenges, they belong to a family of technologies that includes larger, grid-connected versions already being deployed internationally. Ireland does not need to decide on those today. But gaining familiarity with the smallest, safest, most manageable form of nuclear power would give us the knowledge — and the confidence — to make informed choices later.

We do not have time for a 15-year national argument about big nuclear plants. But we do have time for a small, sensible step: test one microreactor, learn from it quickly, and let Irish experience — not fear — guide what comes next. The Irish people are resourceful at home and across our global diaspora, contributing talent and ingenuity to every corner of the world. We should not leave ourselves behind as new opportunities emerge. Ireland deserves to be part of the future, not a spectator to it.

At a moment when energy security, climate targets, and economic competitiveness are all under pressure, curiosity may be the most responsible choice we can make.

Fri, Apr 10 at 12:04 PM

Dear US Media (and others),

This is the difference between how some in influential positions in Ireland see the Artemis II endeavor and those in the US (and broadly the rest of the world) see it.

In Ireland we have historians preaching to us and telling us it's 'disturbing' arrogance and something we shouldn't do. I guess historians live in the past while the rest of us normal people live in the present and future, thank God! :)

Mindboggling!

U.S. bipartisan reaction to the Artemis II launch and mission has been a blend of public excitement, media fascination, market movement, and deeper strategic reflection. Across the country, the mission has been seen not just as a technical milestone but as a cultural moment—one that rekindles the Apollo-era sense of possibility while signaling a new phase of American space ambition. (AI)

I love this great country of America since I emigrated here near 30 years ago xxxxxxxx…….

Kind regards,
Maurice D. Landers

Note by author – Above comment/email is referring to the comment/email immediately below:

Fri, Apr 10 at 10:02 AM

Dear Irish Times,

I read the article today titled, Fawning focus on the Artemis II mission reveals a disturbing arrogance – The Irish Times

If we were to take this argument seriously, we may as well go back to living in caves. I use AI in supporting my argument below.

The article ignores a mountain of very real, very practical benefits that lunar exploration has already given humanity.

Let Mr. Ferriter put his money where his mouth is and throw away anything he owns that has any of the following:

Integrated circuits → the foundation of modern computers and smartphones

Satellite communications → GPS, weather forecasting, global internet

Advanced materials → fire-resistant fabrics, improved insulation, lightweight composites

Medical tech → digital imaging, portable medical devices, improved prosthetics

The moon also gives us data on long-term climate patterns.

The Moon is basically a time capsule. Ignoring it would be like refusing to open the most important archive in the solar system.

If humanity ever wants:

- planetary defense against asteroids
- long-term climate monitoring
- off-world manufacturing
- deep-space telescopes
- Mars missions

…we need the Moon as a proving ground.

Calling that "arrogance" is like calling the invention of the microscope "nosy."

Ferriter's argument treats the Moon like a pristine wilderness. But:

- It has no atmosphere
- No biosphere
- No ecosystems to disrupt
- No indigenous life
- No cultural heritage except the one *we* gave it

We can absolutely damage Earth. We cannot "damage" the Moon in any comparable sense.

We've made a mess of many things on Earth — but exploration has consistently expanded knowledge, technology, and cooperation.

Space exploration is one of the rare global projects that:

- unites nations
- inspires education
- pushes scientific boundaries
- creates long-term benefits

It's the opposite of escapism. It's investment.

How the editor even allowed this article to be published is beyond me...and he won't print anything we send him that make a lot more sense?

This type of article only divides...I guess a reflection of the world we live in today where even journalists jump on the band wagon. So, now we'll have

the moon people and the anti-moon people? Brilliant!

But for a nation like Ireland trying to attract FDI particularly in the Space space, we don't want readers to think we're all cavemen.

Time to wake up Mr. Ferriter...you must be Ferry-tired...I know I am after reading your article! lol

Kind regards,

Maurice D. Landers

p.s. I can't believe I had to write this!

p.p.s. I wonder is Mr. Ferriter any relation to the shyster judge Ferriter who ruled on my case?