

# Re: NEF claims more nuclear power is not way forward

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007-09/msg00021.html>

---

- *From:* "daestrom" <[daestrom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:daestrom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 4 Sep 2007 16:22:05 -0400
- 

"Rolf Martens" <[rolf.martens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rolf.martens@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:O\\_Ci.7781\\$ZA.4126@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:O_Ci.7781$ZA.4126@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article <[46d83bab\\$0\\$32563\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:46d83bab$0$32563$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>, [daestrom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:daestrom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) says...

"EnergyForum.cc" <[fabian@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:fabian@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1188307286.595929.34720@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1188307286.595929.34720@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hello newsgroup members,

This might be of interest to someone:

An environmental think-tank in the UK, New Economics Foundation (NEF), has said that more nuclear power plants in the country is not the way forward for cutting carbon emissions from the power generation sector and reducing the consumption of imported fossil fuels because implementing a nuclear building programme will be slow, expensive and risky. Additionally, it will not have enough of an impact to prevent climate change nor guarantee energy supply security. According to NEF, the cost of building new nuclear reactors is actually triple what is being claimed by supporters of such plans.  
Source: Energy Business Review

This news item is brought to you in association with EnergyForum.cc

Re: NEF claims more nuclear power is not way forward

[www.energyforum.cc/forum](http://www.energyforum.cc/forum)

Your global energy forum on the net!

While I agree that building nuclear plants is 'slow', and you'd have to build a lot of them if that is the only action you take to reduce CO2 emissions, where is the proof that costs are 'actually triple what is being claimed'? Is this political group (NEF) more informed about construction costs? Why are they more 'expert' than the 'experts'??

daestrom

They're not, of course, but are a reactionary propaganda institute. "Manmade global warming" is a hoax too, as is the propaganda against nuclear energy. The common denominator is that the reactionaries want to make all energy scarce and expensive, out of very bad political motives.

And building nuclear power plants is not "slow" either.

Experience here in Sweden in 1970–1985, before the ban set in, shows that a population section of 1 million people easily can build 1 reactor of 1 GW in 15 years. That would be 300 such in the USA in that time, for instance.

But 300 in 15 years does not mean 1 reactor every 6 months. It does take a lot longer time to build a 1000 MW nuc plant than it does to build a 1000 MW natural gas turbine plant. There's just no denying that.

daestrom

.