Nuclear assumed that except dramatic measures are taken

Environment, Climate Change

Nuclear energy may be seen as onefeasible mitigation policy within thebattle against climate change , as this sort of energy resources has extremelylow greenhouse gas emissions throughout its life cycle.

(Dones, R., Heck, T., Hirschberg, S., Cutler, J.

C., , 2004). Generally, it is assumed that exceptdramatic measures are taken to slash down climate change, the humanity might perhapsface an environmental disaster. (Stern, 2007; Adamantiade, A., Kessides, I.,, 2009; Reddy, B.

S., Assenza, G. B.

,, 2009; Decanio, 2009). If critical actionis not taken, energy-related emissions of CO2 will be more than double by 2050and higher oil demand will increase apprehension over the security of supplies. (IEA.

, 2009a)The benefit of nuclear energy has jointly becomeeven more irresistible as a result of the Kyoto Agreement that requiressignatories to extensively cut back their emissions of CO2 so as to cut down toon global warming (Becker and Posner, 2005). Many of us are of the opinion that nuclear energy, as an essentially carbon free source of energy, is one of the answers toclimate change and energy safety (Elliot, 2007; Ferguson, 2007). To this end, severeapprehensions over growing fossil fuel prices, energy security, and greenhousegas emissions have brought about the significance of nuclear energy to the vanguardof the broader drawback of the energy discussion. Nuclear energy is drawing newawareness for increasing the range of energy supplies, for improving energysecurity, and for providing a

low-carbon alternative to fossil fuels. (International EnergyAgency, IEA, 2008).(Pidgeon et al., 2008), has it that the view regarding nuclearenergy policy at the moment is obviously not as divided as it was within the NineteenEighties and Nineties , the assumptions underlying new build proposals aresmartly contested by some environmental teams and academic commentators. Nuclear powercontinues to be bedeviled with uncertainties over its economic science, doubtsregarding accident risks and nuclear blast, and also the quest to finding a lastingsolutions for radioactive waste.

Theliterature opinion on nuclear power points to established public fears inseveral Western nations for some time now. Major disasters including the 1957Windscale fire in England, the Three Mile Island in 1979, the Chernobyl in 1986, and recently the Fukushima accidents, in additiona to the environmental worries as it relates to waste disposal, solely served to reinforcesuch considerations. The resistance to the building of a lot of nuclear power plants within the United States improvedfrom around 20% in the mid1970s to more than 60% in the early Nineteen Eighties, Rosa and Freudenburg (1993) .

A comparable historical pattern was also seenfrom the European data , but amplified further by the impacts of the Chernobylaccident in 1986 (van der Pligt, 1992). Throughout this era, nuclear energy andradioactive material were seen as exclusively “ dreaded” and unknown (Slovic, 1987; Pidgeon et al., 1992.