

Nukes, cont. p. 5

One terrorist attack, successful or not, also negates the whole base load argument for nuclear power plants.

For years we've heard opposition to the Nantucket Sound Wind Project in Massachusetts which was motivated by a few rich people who did not want their view obstructed by wind turbines. When I was in Connecticut a few weeks ago, I was surprised to see that now that the big-name, rich (and liberal) who opposed the project are gone, namely Walter Cronkite and Ted Kennedy, opposition to the project is waning fast because the visual impact is far outweighed by the environmental benefit. Most offshore proposals, such as Delaware's, place the turbines over the horizon, out of sight. If we placed 1 turbine/hectare on the Atlantic continental shelf, we could provide enough electrical power for the entire world. I'm not proposing that we do that. I just want to point out that the potential is enormous and a lot cheaper than nuclear power.

Two years after the 1988 Chernobyl nuclear disaster, Denmark passed a law forbidding the construction of nuclear power plants. The country has very large offshore wind resources. There have been no major problems from wind variability. This wise move propelled Vestas, the Danish wind turbine manufacturer, into the lead in this field.

Green energy is not free but wind power is economic. Even in its unsubsidized status, it costs the same (~5-10 cents/Kwh) as heavily subsidized nuclear and fossil fuel power plants. Solar water heating is also economic. Solar electricity is also, in some desert areas. Wind power generating capacity in the US is increasing at 9%/year. This isn't happening because the power companies are trying to lose money.

Consensus is building that we can transition away from a nuclear/fossil fuel power base. This scares the hell out of the people adhering to the current paradigms. They are spending millions to convince our legislators that we need to maintain the status quo. They are running scared because there is little to back up their claims that we need more nukes and fossil fuel plants. The status quo is not sustainable! Once that

inertia is overcome, we will see a rapid shift to green energy. I predict it will be well underway within 10 years.

I've suggested that money invested in coal or nuclear is money down the tubes as far as sustainability goes. We find ourselves in a profound moral dilemma. The environmental havoc caused by coal and nuclear is unacceptable to leave for future generations. If we had to pay for the environmental destruction and pollution/long-term storage of the waste materials as a part of our electrical bill, the cost of both would be out of sight. It's for just that reason that both industries have had Congress cleverly hide these costs in your taxes. Adherents to conventional energy claim that \$1 invested in coal or nuclear goes farther than \$1 invested in renewable energy. If a coal/nuclear dollar goes farther, then why is only one new nuclear plant receiving a loan guarantee and why have >110 coal-fired power plants been cancelled in the US during the last two years (100 in TX alone!)? Make no doubt about it; the paradigm shift is in full gear.

Another favorite crutch of the pro-nuclear lobby is the French nuclear industry. Now that most of the of the French nukes built in the 50's, 60's, and 70's are nearing

retirement, there is little enthusiasm for building more. The French have an enormous stockpile of spent nuclear fuel that they don't know what to do with. They are turning to wind, solar, and other renewables now to replace the nukes as they are decommissioned in the near future.

I'm not totally against nukes. There is one potentially viable nuclear option. Preliminary tests of small-scale nuclear fusion were successfully completed in California in January. If this eventually can be brought to production, which actually seems likely, it could redirect our energy future, perhaps in as little as 10 years. Unlike lethally dirty fission, the only waste product from fusion is helium. There are other problems with creating a miniature sun, of course, but I am cautiously optimistic.

We are in a transitional period, no doubt. When society made the transition from horse and buggy to automobiles, investors in buggy whip companies disappeared. The same is happening today with coal/nuclear. There is no enthusiasm for either on Wall Street. The major difference is that the government never subsidized buggy whip production. Who wants to be stuck with an inventory of expensive buggy whips?

## The Clarion

### Senior Staff

Editor in Chief:	<b>Travis Wireback</b>	Managing Editor:	<b>John Climer</b>
News Editor:	<b>Open</b>	Copy Editor:	<b>Open</b>
Business Editor:	<b>Open</b>	Layout & Design:	<b>Travis Wireback</b>
Opinion Editor:	<b>Travis Taylor</b>	Photo Editor:	<b>Marc Newton</b>
Arts & Life Editor:	<b>Will Byers</b>	Business Manager:	<b>Emily Clark</b>
Sports Editor:	<b>Open</b>	Faculty Advisor:	<b>John B. Padgett</b>

### Other Staff

Karam Boeshaar  
Dabney Farmer  
David Alexander

Megan Street  
Dimitri McCloghry  
Michael Eleazer

Unsigned editorials represent the collective opinion of the staff of *The Clarion*. Other opinions expressed on this page are those of respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the faculty, staff or administration of Brevard College.

### Letters Policy

*The Clarion* welcomes letters to the editor. We reserve the right to edit letters for length and content. All letters intended for publication must be signed.

**All correspondence should be mailed to:**

*The Clarion*, Brevard College, One Brevard College Drive, Brevard, NC 28712