

Sir,

The argument against building a new generation of nuclear power stations continues to focus on the financial costs and that renewable energy should replace nuclear power.

The 'No' campaign appears to have been encouraged by a new financial survey, carried out by the Nuclear Decommission Authority (NDA) late last year, which suggested that the cost of cleaning up after all the existing UK power stations would exceed £58bn. Hence, the argument, despite the cost being spread over a long period of time, that it would be 'insane' to build a second generation of reactors.

It is however, worth remembering that nuclear power does not contribute to rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere. And whatever way we look at it, the UK population will end up having to shoulder part of the financial burden of saving the planet from the future perils of global warming and climate change.

If we invested in renewable energy and replaced the 91.2 TWh of electricity produced by nuclear power each year with for example wind power, we would have to litter the landscape with a minimum of 22.000 giant 2MWe turbines. With each windmill being taller than the London eye, it would be near impossible to find sufficient sites to get such a project off the ground.

I am not sure what the planet is worth to humanity? But if nuclear power, as part of a balanced energy portfolio of renewable and nuclear power, can help reduce the threat of global warming, it will be worth every billion spend.

Mr. F. Bermann  
Carbon-info.org