

guardian.co.uk

DAMIANCARRINGTON'S ENVIRONMENT'BLOG



Citizens across world oppose nuclear power, poll finds

The debate over nuclear energy is fiendishly complex, but one important factor is public opinion, and people in 24 nations across the world oppose it



Nuclear power plants in the US, such as New Jersey's Oyster Creek, are supported by 52% of Americans. Photograph: Stan Honda/AFP/Getty Images

I've been able to express my thoughts on [nuclear power](#) on this blog, but what do the citizens of the world think? A new opinion poll from [Ipsos MORI](#) tells us: 62% of citizens in 24 countries across the world oppose the use of nuclear [energy](#), with a quarter of those having change their minds after the [Fukushima disaster](#).

Before looking in more detail at the poll, let me make very clear that I think the debate over nuclear power is a fiendishly complex one. It encompasses the risks of rising carbon dioxide, the strength of political will behind renewables like wind and solar, whether the true cost of nuclear can be calculated and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I don't think there's an easy formula that combines all these factors and into which you can feed data and get the "right" answer. You have to make your own judgements about some things, [as I've written before](#), and one of those things is public opinion.

This is a proper poll, across a wide range of countries and details of the poll methodology is at the end of this post. I am also promised a link to the full data, which I have only as a file. I'll add that when it arrives.

So what stands out? The most anti-nuclear nations in the poll, at about 80% against, were [Italy](#), [Germany](#) and Mexico. Only three of the 24 countries had majorities that favoured nuclear power: India (61%), Poland (57%) and the [US](#) (52%). The UK and Sweden were split 50-50 within the uncertainty cited.

In [France](#), where most of the electricity is produced by nuclear, 67% opposed it, the same percentage as in coal-rich Australia. Perhaps surprisingly, 42% of people in Japan, still recovering from the huge tremor that wrecked the Fukushima nuclear plant, remain supportive of nuclear power.

The pollsters also asked whether people opposed other ways of generating electricity. With 62% against, nuclear was the least popular, followed by coal (52% against), gas (20%), hydroelectricity (9%), wind power (7%) and solar power (3%).

Polls can't tell us why people hold the opinions they do. But its blindingly clear that renewables have global support. It is possible to keep the lights on without nuclear, if renewables get the huge support needed from governments. My question is whether [governments are listening to what people want?](#)

Methodology: The survey was conducted in 24 countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United States of America. An international sample of 18,787 adults aged 18-64 were interviewed between May 6 and May 21, 2011 via the Ipsos Online Panel system. Approximately 1000+ individuals participated in each country with the exception of Argentina, Indonesia, Mexico, Poland, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Sweden, Russia and Turkey, where each have a sample 500+. Weighting was then employed to balance demographics and ensure that the sample's composition reflected that of the adult population according to the most recent country Census data and to provide results intended to approximate the sample universe. A survey with an unweighted probability sample of this size and a 100% response rate would have an estimated margin of error of +/-3.1 percentage points for a sample of 1,000 and an estimated margin of error of +/- 4.5 percentage points for a sample of 500.

[Next](#)

[Previous](#)

[Blog home](#)

[Ads by Google](#)

[Nuclear Power Stats](#)

Gain insights on nuclear power industry trends with our new tool.

[www.bgov.com](#)

[Affordable Solar Power](#)

Save Each Month with a Solar Lease! Try Our Solar Savings Calculator

[www.SolarCity.com/SolarPowerQuote](#)

[Best in Residential Solar](#)

The Nation's #1 Home Solar Service. Get Started for \$1,000 Today.

[www.SunRunHome.com](#)

Comments in chronological order (Total 259 comments)

 Staff

 Contributor



[gubulgaria](#)

23 June 2011 5:46PM

From those results, it rather looks as though the public have a much better understanding of the real issues in energy policy than any politician.

I expect the 7% of people who oppose wind will all soon be commenting here.

Recommend? (35)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[dirkbruere](#)

23 June 2011 5:46PM

Question: Would you rather have:

- a) No nuclear power
- b) No electricity

Recommend? (87)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[gubulgaria](#)

23 June 2011 5:49PM

@ dirkbruere

Question: Would you rather have:

- a) Pointless false dichotomies
- b) A sensible energy policy

Recommend? (110)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[onthefence](#)

23 June 2011 6:06PM

gubulgaria: *From those results, it rather looks as though the public have a much better understanding of the real issues in energy policy than any politician.*

Do your own opinions coincide with the majority view of public opinion on all subjects?

If you found that one of your opinions differed from the majority view, would you conclude that

"Most people disagree with me, therefore I must be wrong".

.
Damian Carrington seems to be new to the "debating" thing -- slowly grinding his way through the logical fallacies.

He's got as far as "*argumentum ad populum*" with this post. He thinks he's got a brilliant argument.

Recommend? (69)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DaveAboard](#)

23 June 2011 6:12PM

Extraordinarily complicated issue. My layman's perception is that whilst folk may be initially opposed to the construction of Nuclear power stations in their area, once they are established there is a general support for them as they bring employment and a level of economic prosperity to an area as they tend to be the only major employer there.

They're also less prone to general economic downturn as demand for electricity is fairly inelastic. In reality, a lot of objections seem to come from people who live far away. I spent a long period of time in Leiston in Suffolk, essentially the town which serves and is

served by Sizewell. An announcement whilst I was there that the plant was to be expanded was greeted by a lot of positive response and very little negative.

There is obviously a raised awareness due to the Fukushima tragedy but, I have to say, the backlash doesn't seem as great as one would have expected and, from what I can tell, many people are of the opinion that there wasn't actually a lot of damage caused by the leaks so what's the problem? I'm not saying that this is the right or wrong way to think, simply that it is how opinion seems to be. And, I guess, there haven't been that many nuclear accidents (that we have been told about, at least!) and Fukushima is perceived to be the result of an extraordinary event which "couldn't happen here".

On the other hand, there seems to be a backlash against windfarms due to the visual impact and the fact that they don't create much in the way of local employment or benefit. Where I now live in Northants (an area where they are springing up all over) the general opinion is that "a handful of farmers get rich whilst the rest of us have to look at the damn things". There is also much speculation fostered by the "no" campaign that they cost more to run than they generate and the carbon footprint of construction and transportation is greater than that saved over the lifetime of a turbine.

The main issue, though, is that public awareness of environmental issues is not high and, particularly in the current economic environment, does not figure highly on folks' lists of priorities.

Recommend? (16)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[EwanB](#)

23 June 2011 6:13PM

The debate over nuclear energy is fiendishly complex, but one important factor is public opinion, and people in 24 nations across the world oppose it

Which probably has something to do with people like yourself making evidence free statements about both the costs and dangers involved with the technology. Effective democracy is dependant on the public having access to factual information to inform their opinions - which is why I keep asking you to back up your statements regarding the cost and danger of nuclear with actual evidence.

Recommend? (61)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DrSG](#)

23 June 2011 6:18PM

Before someone says renewables can't power the world, lets just lay that one to rest with these various [energy scenario reports](#).

Also, fossil fuels and nuclear have subsidies too.

Thanks

Recommend? (40)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[everchanging](#)

23 June 2011 6:18PM

Nuclear power will be needed as a solid stable energy source in the future unpleasant "climate-changed world" until nuclear fusion comes on-line in around 25 years. But combine it massively with solar on every roof-top and other renewables.

Recommend? (17)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DaveAboard](#)

23 June 2011 6:19PM

The major difficulty with "for or against" polling is that there really needs to be a third question..."are you really that bothered?.....yes or no". Sad but true.

Recommend? (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[ireadnews](#)

23 June 2011 6:25PM

It is sad that so many are swayed by the lies written and spoken by the media. Nuclear power is incredibly safe, far safer than many current forms of power production. A poll of the entire world would also be subject to massive error percentages too I would think. So that makes a poll of the entire world almost useless unless it was incredibly indepth, which would probably take years.

Recommend? (42)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[greenfinger](#)

23 June 2011 6:27PM

Given that there's a lot of nuclear waste to take care of, over a period of ahem, 200,000 years approx. [Don't quote me]

Not to mention the fact that French owned energy companies, should there be any, might consider dumping some extra over here.

There **is** an argument to continue with a few new ones, based at the older sites.

Always *assuming* (trust me I'm a nuclear figures doctor) that the costs are correct.

They've never been correct in the past!

And that we the tax payer will not have to pay the unmentionable costs of clear-up and insurance. We always do end up paying - just as well then that nuclear clear-up has not taken place, very much at all so far!

And that the underground storage facilities, when created will be stable over the 1/2 life [technical talk]. Without any leaks contaminating ground water etc.. I have a guarantee here in my hand.

There you are then?

Recommend? (9)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 6:31PM

A recent Populus poll in the UK found more people in favour of new nuclear power stations than against them:

42% in favour, 31 % opposed, 27% don't know.

The question was

Do you support or oppose the building of a new generation of nuclear power stations in the UK?

The poll was conducted April 21st 2011 - April 25th 2011.

A pdf of its findings and methodology can be downloaded from

<http://www.populuslimited.com/populus-british-attitudes-to-new-nuclear-power-stations-250411.html>

There is usually a substantial "don't know" section which precludes a majority of all polled for or against. We don't worry about this when electing a government. Something like 40% or less gets a government elected.

Recommend? (42)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



SteB1

23 June 2011 6:32PM

This is the point I have constantly made in the debates about nuclear power both after the Fukushima nuclear disaster and for the last 20 years. Those advocating nuclear power as a solution to carbon emissions and energy security ,do not take into account the political reality. Again and again, plans for nuclear power expansion and nuclear waste disposal are abandoned after public opposition. Nuclear power is one of those things on which the public can be nonchalant at a distance, and to future plans, but when it comes to building actual nuclear power stations or disposing of nuclear waste to them, public opposition grows. Politicians in democracies simply do not follow through things which may make them very unpopular with the public, they push decisions onto future generations of politicians.

So those who advocate a nuclear fix are not dealing with the historical reality of what happens, and that a strategy based on nuclear power will almost certainly be left floundering after political U-turns - and these expansion plans never actually get converted in actual generation capacity. In other words it is not a realistic solution. It will be noticed that a very large proportion of nuclear power stations in democracies were built during the cold war, or other military tension, which allowed the governments more ability to push it through.

People simply do not trust governments over nuclear power. The Fukushima nuclear disaster just confirmed most people's worries. Again and again they heard reassurances that everything was fine, followed by footage shown by media all around the world of the explosions. The authorities assure people there is nothing to worry about, and see people in full protective gear scanning people with radiation detectors. They saw how governments around the world panicked about anyone possibly contaminated with radiation. So they say, we may not know that much about it, but look how the governments who supposedly know about the dangers in a complete spin, and they see how they lie and give false reassurances soon contradicted. This makes them think the government is lying to them about the dangers, and so naturally they are alarmed.

Anyone that can't grasp this has no comprehension of how public perception works. This political reality is not going to be easily undone. So no matter what arguments those advocating nuclear power as a solution put forward, they need to face up to the reality, that regardless of their arguments, a strategy based on nuclear power, will mean a great big gap in our energy production, when the plans inevitably get shelved. There is a lot of history, which demonstrates what happens, and the advocates of nuclear power ignore this. Arguing the toss on the relative risks, simply makes no impact on most of

the public, who do not listen to, or hear these arguments. Most of the public sees the secrecy and the inconsistencies between what governments say about the safety of nuclear power, and how clueless and panicked these same governments are when something goes wrong.

I see our government has revealed the sites earmarked for new nuclear power stations, all of them adjacent to old nuclear power plants. This is presumably to make it easy to railroad new ones through against probable public opposition. Self-evidently they believe it will be easier to get through construction of a new one, if there is already one there. I think we will eventually see another U-turn, although the present government probably has the luxury of passing the buck on to actually building them to a future government, which will probably procrastinate, and push it onto the next government. Nuclear power is only a solution if that power generation exists, arguments for it don't generate anything but unrealistic ideas.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-13887579>

Recommend? (15)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 6:46PM

It is possible to keep the lights on without nuclear, if renewables get the huge support needed from governments.

Please substantiate that claim, including full costings, full projections of economic impacts with detailed EROEI analysis, including *all* conceivable embedded energy. You see, your renewables aren't sustainable without fossil fuels.

the debate over nuclear power is a fiendishly complex one. It encompasses the risks of rising carbon dioxide, the strength of political will behind renewables like wind and solar, whether the true cost of nuclear can be calculated and the proliferation of nuclear weapons

Oh dear, another of Damian Carrington's ungainly attempts to shape the debate. You're missing something rather elephant-sized, Damian: -

The debate over nuclear power encompasses the risks of having no effective response to forthcoming oil and coal shortage, causing massive economic dislocation and human suffering.

Recommend? (44)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[BobD](#)

23 June 2011 6:48PM

The choice is back renewables, back energy efficiency and phase out nuclear; or back renewables, back energy efficiency and phase out fossil fuels.

Because this is the choice, there can be no denying that anti-nuclear means pro-fossil fuels, in practice. It's very silly to pretend otherwise.

I wonder if that's how the question was put in any of these surveys. And I wonder how many people were answering from a sense of understanding of the issues rather than an over-hyped sense of fear exacerbated by poor journalism.

Still, Damian is right - we live in a democracy. If a majority decide they'd rather do A than B, then A it is. The facts are neither here nor there if nobody wants to bother to understand them.

Recommend? (22)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 6:49PM

@SteB1

No, because the plans won't get shelved. Just like they didn't get shelved in France or anywhere else in the world where nuclear facilities have been built.

LOL!

Recommend? (21)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[SteB1](#)

23 June 2011 6:49PM

@onthefence

Damian Carrington seems to be new to the "debating" thing -- slowly grinding his way through the logical fallacies.

He's got as far as "argumentum ad populum" with this post. He thinks he's got a brilliant argument.

Actually, the logical fallacy is in ignoring the historical political reality of how this innate public mistrust of nuclear power and nuclear waste, means that strategies for it inevitably get abandoned. The logical fallacy is believing that this time their arguments will win the day. A somewhat unrealistic view when these arguments have repeatedly failed to convince the public before. This reality obstacle just got much, much bigger after the Fukushima nuclear disaster.

It may be an "argumentum ad populum" logical fallacy to claim lots of the public oppose nuclear power, therefore it is wrong or a bad idea, simply because of this public opposition. However, it is certainly not a logical fallacy to point out that this innate public opposition to nuclear power, will ultimately result in the political wilting of nuclear power expansion plans. Just look at all the government U-turns on all manner of things in response to a solid block of public opposition. This is especially true when this public opposition cuts across the political divides, as will the nuclear issue. The last Tory government ditched the nuclear waste disposal plans after the public opposition to the NIREX test drilling. That government was not noted for being finicky, and its leader famously said the lady is not for turning, or whatever Thatcher actually said. You see the opposition to this test drilling came from solidly Tory parts of the public, and it wasn't just environmentalists.

Recommend? (12)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 6:51PM

The debate over nuclear power encompasses the risks of having no effective response to forthcoming oil and coal shortage, causing massive economic dislocation and human suffering.

Recommend? (25)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[algefern](#)

23 June 2011 7:00PM

The question has been posed incorrectly. No-one on the planet opposes nuclear energy, for that is what we depend on for life, radiant energy from the sun as a result of nuclear fusion reactions.

Do you oppose nuclear fission power stations? is the question that should have been asked. There is always a cost to division, and in the case of nuclear fission it is the long-lived waste radioactive products. The benefit is generating capacity comparable to fossil fuels without the carbon dioxide. As to this matter, doing nothing and burning lots of oil isn't too clever either, when petrol-driven vehicles could be removed from the roads and replaced with electric ones if only we had the generating capacity.

The advantage of both carbon neutrality and low risk from radioactive waste can both be gained from nuclear fusion, so it really is long overdue that politicians put a cork in it and direct money towards doing the research. Fifty years ago this is why fusion stations were built in the first place - as a stopgap..

Recommend? (3)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DaveAboard](#)

23 June 2011 7:01PM

I see our government has revealed the sites earmarked for new nuclear power stations. Ironically, all of them sites proposed by Ed Miliband in 2009 which the now-government (then in opposition) claimed at the time had "no democratic legitimacy".

Recommend? (5)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[SteB1](#)

23 June 2011 7:08PM

@nosurrendermonkey

@SteB1

No, because the plans won't get shelved. Just like they didn't get shelved in France or anywhere else in the world where nuclear facilities have been built.

LOL!

It's funny that you cite the one exception where there was an expanded nuclear power programme, facilitated by France's independent nuclear weapons programme.

Maybe you will point to the successful nuclear power expansion in the UK and the US, where indeed there were many previous nuclear power expansion plans. Why didn't they get built - LOL!

Recommend? (10)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[panicbutton](#)

23 June 2011 7:20PM

Energy is just one part of the equation. The more energy we have, the faster we will deplete other resources, not just minerals, but fresh water, forests, the seas and the rest of the ecological super-system which supports life.

Even if it was safe and clean, nuclear would be the wrong choice. Energy conservation, renewables and a whole new economic system are needed if everyone is to have the chance of a decent life.

We need to abandon this insane pursuit of exponential growth and live within the planet's means to avoid a very ugly future.

Fat chance, I know.

Recommend? (16)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[Harrywr2](#)

23 June 2011 7:24PM

@SteB1

and the US, where indeed there were many previous nuclear power expansion plans.

The inflation adjusted price of coal declined in the US between 1979 and 1999.

While there is \$14/ton steam coal in the US Midwest it's been a very long, long time since steam coal could be extracted in the UK for anywhere near \$14/ton.

Last I checked UK coal was struggling to make profit with steam coal prices in the UK above \$80/ton.

Different places, different resources = different solutions.

Recommend? (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[onthefence](#)

23 June 2011 7:28PM

SteB1: *Actually, the logical fallacy is in ignoring the historical political reality of how this innate public mistrust of nuclear power and nuclear waste, means that strategies for it inevitably get abandoned.*

On-shore wind tends to attract substantial public opposition in the UK.

Do you apply the same arguments to wind power?

"Someone is opposed to it, therefore it won't happen, therefore we must abandon it".

Recommend? (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[onthefence](#)

23 June 2011 7:30PM

SteB1: *Why didn't they get built - LOL!*

...because coal and gas were (and are) cheaper.

The case against nuclear always falls back to the point that gas is cheaper.

Recommend? (18)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[sellafieldsoulsinger](#)

23 June 2011 7:30PM

None of the major political parties in the UK are prepared to obey the public's preference for the abandonment of nuclear power. If there was a referendum today the British public would bin nuclear forever. It is an insult to our democracy.

Recommend? (16)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 7:31PM

@Steb1

Every nuclear plant that has ever been built has been part of an "expansion plan" and each and every one of them says you're talking nonsense. Obviously none of them were shelved.

Moreover, as oil and coal shortage problems grow, even the most dozy members of the public are going to discern that something serious is amiss and they are going to clamour for effective solutions, which whether you like it or not, involves substantial development of nuclear power.

Practically any number of extra reactors could be added at existing sites, but I think the public will welcome new sites as well as global economic conditions whipsaw.

Recommend? (24)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[ColinG](#)

23 June 2011 7:31PM

People tend to poll against nuclear power when they don't know enough about it.

"Researchers found that opposition was often a default position for people who just felt they did not have enough information to actually say they supported nuclear."

<http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/newsarticle.aspx?id=26705>

"The "information vacuum," Ipsos MORI found, was "often filled by suspicion and fear, generated in many cases by popular culture." Although 49% of people admitted they did not know enough about nuclear energy to form an opinion, when asked "What kinds of things, if anything, would you really like to know about nuclear energy" about the same number of people could offer no answer."

"Ipsos MORI said that it found some individuals who said they opposed nuclear energy "proved on closer questioning to know very little about it and had no basis on which to evaluate it." "

Recommend? (27)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[jemay](#)

23 June 2011 7:31PM

An Ipsos/Reuters poll survey shows that 51 percent of people in the world believe in God. Only 18 percent don't and 17 percent are undecided.

<http://www.christianpost.com/news/global-poll-most-believe-in-god-afterlife-49994/>

This is interesting, significant even, and certainly something that needs to be taken into account in any world/national debate and-or decision-making.

But does it prove anything?

I'd still rather have a qualified surgeon operate on me, or qualified scientist/engineer make technical decisions on my behalf, rather than some half-baked reporters or presenters who believe they know better.

Recommend? (11)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[WoodwardRobert](#)

23 June 2011 7:54PM

ireadnews

23 June 2011 6:25PM

It is sad that so many are swayed by the lies written and spoken by the media. Nuclear power is incredibly safe, far safer than many current forms of power production.

Utter nonsense. Electricity generation from nuclear fission is anything but safe, in the normal usage of the term "safe". As well as being inherrantly dangerous, statistically it is one of the most dangerous forms of electricity generation compared to other generation methods. The probability of major a nuclear accident is high and the risk (impact * probability) of it is unacceptably high and thje effects of an accident long-lasting, also, compared to other generation methods.

The generation of nuclear power produces highly dangerous radioactive waste for which there is no viable long term storage available or that can be guaranteed to be safe for the next half million years.

Recommend? (9)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[WoodwardRobert](#)

23 June 2011 7:59PM

NoSurrenderMonkey

23 June 2011 7:31PM

@Steb1

Moreover, as oil and coal shortage problems grow, even the most dozy members of the public are going to discern that something serious is amiss and they are going to clamour for effective solutions, which whether you like it or not, involves substantial development of nuclear power.

Explain just how is nuclear power going to compensate for the effect of the decline in the availability of oil ?

Most oil used for fuel, is used transport. Nuclear power is not going to replace oil-based fuels used for transport.

Recommend? (6)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[BobD](#)

23 June 2011 8:09PM

@WoodwardRobert "statistically [fission] is one of the most dangerous forms of electricity generation compared to other generation methods" - what statistical measure do you base that on?

Recommend? (19)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[piffedoff](#)

23 June 2011 8:12PM

<<essentially the town which serves and is served by Sizewell. An announcement whilst I was there that the plant was to be expanded was greeted by a lot of positive response and very little negative>>

yeah, people can be bleeding stupid.

Recommend? (2)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[skoobysnax](#)

23 June 2011 8:15PM

The same pro-nuke trolls post on every article...my question: do you people have day jobs or is this it?

Recommend? (12)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DaveMart](#)

23 June 2011 8:17PM

'It is possible to keep the lights on without nuclear, if renewables get the huge support needed from governments. '

No there is not. There is no way at all within present technology of running a densely populated high latitude country on renewables.

Ah, but we should push on, and the technology will improve! They cry.

It is utter folly to play ducks and drakes with the survival of a country gambling on a breakthrough.

For 'alternatives' such as, say, wave power, it would take many years to prove them, even supposing that it could be done, let alone deploy in bulk.

If we are talking about proper planning, we have to use what we have, and only expect relatively small incremental gains coming from well-understood processes.

That means nuclear, fossil fuels, and land based wind turbines.

We are taking a huge punt on off-shore wind, as we are deploying vast fleets of these when the designs are entirely untested, particularly for difficult maintenance at sea, at a cost of around 3 times that of the actual output of nuclear power.

As for solar, in Germany in mid-winter the solar arrays get between 6% and down to a staggering **1 Percent** of their nominal output on a winters day.

A source which does not provide power when it is most needed, but displaces other power when it is not, has a **negative** net worth to the grid.

This is lunacy, and the product of religious extremism, not a rational action.

The purported alternative of 'renewables' does not in fact exist., and the author indulges in pure wishful thinking with imponderable but certainly expensive costs by his blind

faith that it can be done.

Up to 50,000 people in this country per year are 'excess winter deaths'.

The cost to the fuel poor in this country in paying the electricity bills that will arise from such irresponsible fantasies will put that number way up.

Real deaths of real people, consequent on a neurotic failure to deal with reality,

Recommend? (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DaveAboard](#)

23 June 2011 8:27PM

yeah, people can be bleeding stupid

I'm sure you're right, but if it's a choice between work or no work then what would you do? Coal mining was one of the dirtiest and most dangerous jobs in the country and cost thousands of lives through injury and illness but the miners still fought to the bitter end to continue to mine. According to a report yesterday 4,000 people a year are dying in London due to bad air quality, but there are probably more Londoners against the green agenda than for it as it hits them in the pocket and restricts their supposed freedoms. As I said above, Option 3, "Not really bothered" will prevail.

Recommend? (3)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[SteB1](#)

23 June 2011 8:31PM

@onthefence

On-shore wind tends to attract substantial public opposition in the UK.

Do you apply the same arguments to wind power?

"Someone is opposed to it, therefore it won't happen, therefore we must abandon it".

I'm not sure where the quote is from as it doesn't appear to be taken from what I said. However, there is an important qualitative difference between the two types of public opposition, which means that in reality the arguments belong to different logical types. Although the common words give the false impression they are similar things, when they are not.

People object to windpower, because they don't like their view being spoiled. People object to nuclear power because they are terrified of it. There is a profound difference between the two scenarios. It is a classic case of mistaking the map for the territory, confusing the word for the phenomenon. Because the same word "object" is used, it is mistakenly assumed that it is the same phenomena. Whereas the objection to something because it spoils someone's views, is of an entirely different order than someone objecting to something because they are terrified of it. The dynamics of the basis of this objection are profoundly different.

What you mistakenly think is that I am arguing a particular stereotypical viewpoint and using a concocted argument to further my viewpoint. Whereas I am just pointing to what the situation is. I am simply pointing out that if you build a strategy on an expanded nuclear power programme, that it is very likely you will be left with a problem and a big hole in the strategy, when this expanded nuclear power generation capacity, fails to materialise.

It is rather like a traveller, stopping a traveller proceeding to where they have just come from, and informing them that there is a collapsed bridge ahead. The obstacle I described exists regardless of what you or I think about it.

Recommend? (6)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[lizelizabeth](#)

23 June 2011 8:32PM

"Citizens across world oppose nuclear power, poll finds"

I love it when liberals use public opinion as evidence for their own views. Most citizens want the use of capital punishment for certain crimes, polls show, but I guess that's when the public must be ignored?

Recommend? (15)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[NoSurrenderMonkey](#)

23 June 2011 8:33PM

@WoodwardRobert

Explain just how is nuclear power going to compensate for the effect of the decline in the availability of oil ?

1, Electrification of transport: Electric trains, light delivery vehicles and private cars, along with hybrid buses and trucks and private cars.

2, Displacement of coal and gas from power generation to the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuel.

a) Gas to liquids as with the Shell Perl plant in Qatar.

b) Coal to liquids, as with a major new Chinese project involving dimethyl ether.

http://www.greencarcongress.com/2006/08/china_launches_.html

3, Displacement of natural gas from space heating - to be used for synthetic fuel as described above.

Recommend? (19)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[onthefence](#)

23 June 2011 8:43PM

SteB1: *Although the common words give the false impression they are similar things, when they are not.*

So I take it your answer is "no".

Your "*argumentum ad populum*" applies to nuclear, but not to wind, because you discern different motives for the opposition in the two cases.

SteB1: *I'm not sure where the quote is from as it doesn't appear to be taken from what I said.*

It's called a "paraphrase". Are you genuinely unfamiliar with this concept?

SteB1: *It is a classic case of mistaking the map for the territory, confusing the word for the phenomenon.*

er, no.

Recommend? (13)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[BunnyFlumplekins](#)

23 June 2011 9:29PM

Can we have a few more articles on nuclear please.
There's very little coverage in CIF.

Recommend? (11)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DrSG](#)

23 June 2011 9:37PM

News from America suggest 48 out of 65 nuclear plants is leaking radioactive material,
in some cases contaminating nearby ground drinking water.

<http://The article from the San Francisco Chronicle can be found here.>

Recommend? (10)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[DrSG](#)

23 June 2011 9:40PM

...and on objection to wind farms (above) these are issues with the planning system that
need to be addressed.

Typical wind farm:

200 supporters

10 vocal objectors

1000 people don't mind either way

The result? The objectors manage to get projects cancelled; something the majority want
built does not happen.

A clear call for an overhaul of the planning system.

Recommend? (7)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



[Chronos](#)

23 June 2011 9:41PM

This comment was removed by a moderator because it didn't abide by our [community standards](#). Replies may also be deleted. For more detail see [our FAQs](#).



[DrSG](#)

23 June 2011 9:46PM

The same pro-nuke trolls post on every article...my question: do you people have day
jobs or is this it?

It's got worse since the Times online started charging.

Seems a quid a week is too much.

Recommend? (7)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



pguk

23 June 2011 9:51PM

I dare say people also want safe cheap reliable electricity, with a stable supply, no climate change, cheap food and preservation of ecosystems.

Wind - not reliable, expensive (particular if you factor in pump storage)

Solar - not reliable, expensive

Desert Solar - would potentially not from stable suppliers

Biofuels - destroy ecosystem, make food expensive

Hydro - destroys ecosystems and is potentially dangerous (if dam bursts)

Fossil Fuel - Cause global warming

... Summary people cannot have what they want.. Politicians are elected to make sensible compromises.

Recommend? (23)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



pguk

23 June 2011 9:52PM

@DrSG

same anti-nuclear trolls... with the same scientifically and economically illiterate arguments

Recommend? (16)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



BunnyFlumplekins

23 June 2011 10:06PM

@DrSG

It's got worse since the Times online started charging.

Seems a quid a week is too much

Damn right. That patio-heater gas doesn't buy itself.

Etc.

By the way, that was trolling. What you see repeatedly on these pages, day after day, is intelligent people arguing against when they genuinely believe is scare-mongering anti-nuclear garbage, which will lead to serious negative outcomes for people and/or the planet.

I couldn't care less if you work for a wind-farm company and buy your clothes from solar-power-are-us - if you've got a decent argument, I'll listen to it. On some issues, you have. On nuclear, I've never seen one yet.

Recommend? (13)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

| [Link](#)



SteB1

23 June 2011 10:39PM

@onthefence

It's called a "paraphrase". Are you genuinely unfamiliar with this concept?

Yes I am very familiar with the concept, but the general convention is not to put it in direct quotations, not to pass it off as what that person actually said, and most importantly to ensure your paraphrasing of something keeps to the gist of what was said. If the paraphrasing is used to misrepresent what someone said to make it easy to argue against, this is dishonest, and it is known as the the Straw Man Logical fallacy. Are you really telling me you are unfamiliar with this particular logical fallacy, because you were the one who brought up logical fallacies, and this is a classic one, and classic use of a very well known logical fallacy?

SteB1: Although the common words give the false impression they are similar things, when they are not.

So I take it your answer is "no".

Your "argumentum ad populum" applies to nuclear, but not to wind, because you discern different motives for the opposition in the two cases.

SteB1: I'm not sure where the quote is from as it doesn't appear to be taken from what I said.

It's called a "paraphrase". Are you genuinely unfamiliar with this concept?

SteB1: It is a classic case of mistaking the map for the territory, confusing the word for the phenomenon.

er, no.

Your whole post entirely misrepresents what I said, hence **THE STRAW MAN LOGICAL FALLACY** in upper case and bold, because it is quite an extreme misrepresentation of what I said.

What I clearly said is people object to windfarms because it spoils their view. People object to nuclear power because they are terrified of it. Therefore the whole dynamics of this objection, and its nature, are entirely different. Got it yet?

Are you really telling me that you cannot understand the qualitative difference between people objecting to something because it spoils their view, and people objecting to something because they are terrified of it?

You see, I think you know very well what I said, and you know very well you are disingenuously misquoting me, because presumably you don't have a cogent response to the points I made.

Recommend? (8)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

[Link](#)



SteB1

23 June 2011 10:42PM

@lizelizabeth

"Citizens across world oppose nuclear power, poll finds"

I love it when liberals use public opinion as evidence for their own views.

Democracy is such a drag isn't it? I take it you are not a fan of democracy and prefer rule by an elite or dictatorship?

Recommend? (13)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#)

[Link](#)

Comments on this page are now closed.

guardian.co.uk © Guardian News and Media Limited 2011

