

Nuclear power debate

[Science](#), [Physics](#)



They point to the problem of storing radioactive waste that has a high risk for severe radioactive contamination and the possibility of nuclear proliferation. So it is certainly a critical debate. We can see these rhetorical effects of the positive and negative attitude towards nuclear power. Although nuclear power plants have a past record of safety and efficiency with discharging no green house gases in the atmosphere, the question is why the number of plants in U. S. A has been declined in the past few years and the percentage of electricity from nuclear power is not as high as that of other countries like Japan, France. It is said that the industry has been declined because of fierce emotional resistance to this unreliable technology that has a great potential of accidental deadly radiation. Is it merely an emotional matter to protest against this serious matter? The fact is why it would be unreliable technology when it has efficiency, sustainability and safety of operation. So it can be said that it is the misuse of this technology which can be turned in to the global threat. The most funny thing is that still there is no initiative to invent the new technology to dispose the plants' radioactive waste. So although it is not producing green house gases but its unmannered waste is seriously dangerous for public health and safety. At last it is also mentioned that the vice president Dick Cheney emphasized on building new nuclear power plants, but it is not a fun to build new nuclear power plants in a short time.