

Media Support for Nuclear Energy and New Plants

Editorials

Albuquerque Journal | June 29, 2005

"With energy prices continuing to distress most Americans, President Bush took the high – though still controversial – road last week in advocating a future in which more of the nation's electricity will be generated by nuclear power plants. Citing France, where 78 percent of the electricity comes from nuclear power, compared with 20 percent in the United States, Bush said the obvious: 'It's time for this country to start building nuclear power plants again.' "

Amarillo Globe | July 3, 2005

"We've noted for years that presidents and congresses controlled by both parties have neglected this urgent need [for energy policy]. President Bush must push hard for an energy policy that combines renewable sources – such as the plentiful Panhandle wind – nuclear and other alternative sources to complement the fossil fuels that remain so vital to this nation's industrial infrastructure."

The Arizona Republic | June 27, 2005

"For too long, the words "nuclear power" have been either toxic or magic. Putting aside the rhetoric, there is a real promise in nuclear power for meeting our energy needs and reducing global warming."

Baltimore Sun | May 8, 2005

"Nuclear power is emerging from its quarter-century in limbo since the 1979 radiation leak at Three Mile Island scared everybody silly. Reliable, affordable, emission-free and safe if properly managed, nuclear energy is being promoted by President Bush as an alternative too attractive to ignore."

Baltimore Sun | July 7, 2005

"Meanwhile, environmentalists are taking a new look at nuclear power as among the most promising of clean fuel alternatives."

Bangor (ME) Daily News | May 2, 2005

"So, it is no surprise that President Bush is urging Congress to move forward with an energy plan that increases the supply of oil, gasoline and even nuclear power. Some of these ideas are good, but are meaningless without government policies to move them forward. ... The biggest obstacle for building new nuclear plants, for example, is not the cost, although that is an issue. The biggest problem is lack of permanent storage for radioactive waste."

Editorials supporting nuclear energy

Albuquerque Journal
Amarillo Globe
The Arizona Republic
Baltimore Sun
Bangor (ME) Daily News
Berkshire(MA) Eagle
Boston Globe
Chicago Sun-Times
The (Jackson, MS)
Clarion-Ledger
Contra Costa Times
(Walnut Creek, CA)
Decatur (AL) Daily
Denver Post
Detroit News
East Valley Tribune
(Scottsdale/Mesa, AZ)
The Economist
Financial Times
Fort Worth Star-Telegram
Grand Rapids Press
Greenville (SC) News
High Point (NC)
Enterprise
The Hill
Huntsville (AL) Times
The Indianapolis Star
Investor's Business Daily
The Jersey Journal
Kalamazoo (MI) Gazette
Milwaukee (WI) Journal
Sentinel
Mobile (AL) Register
The (McAllen, TX) Monitor
Monticello (MN) Times
New York Times
The New Republic

Berkshire (MA) Eagle | April 30, 2005

"The one smart feature of the Republican energy bill passed by the House in April and now moving through the Senate is the effort to breathe new life into America's stagnating nuclear-energy industry. ... Costs have fallen and designs have greatly improved. Several plans for new plants are under review, and the Bush administration is right to promote a technology used efficiently and safely in much of the world."

Boston Globe | June 16, 2005

"The financial case for existing nuclear plants has been enhanced by the improved productivity of the plants in recent years and the many owners success in getting their licenses renewed for an extra 20 years. If new reactor designs prove as safe as hoped and if progress is made on waste disposal, proliferation prevention, and protection against terrorism, nuclear power will deserve a chance to compete in the market against other sources of power that do not emit CO₂."

Chicago Sun-Times | May 2, 2005

"The energy legislation that passed the House includes some suspect ideas. ... But the need for new refineries and nuclear plants is beyond debate and partisan concerns."

The (Jackson, MS) Clarion-Ledger | June 21, 2005

"While the price of natural gas has skyrocketed, if we want plentiful, affordable energy that doesn't contribute greenhouse gases for global warming, nuclear is the way to go. The issues of nuclear energy – including technology – have changed dramatically since the Grand Gulf [nuclear plant] was built. A mix of energy sources outside of oil and gas, including nuclear, is needed for the future."

Contra Costa Times (Walnut Creek, CA) | July 13, 2005

"The energy bill that cleared the Senate, for example, should have mandated higher gas mileage in motor vehicles and done more to promote nuclear power and alternative forms of energy."

Decatur (AL) Daily | January 16, 2005

"Surely there is a compromise between the past and present that won't endanger the public while making these plants more profitable to construct and operate. The nation runs on energy and nuclear power is a vital part of the mix."

Denver Post | July 9, 2005

"Nuclear reactors generate 'baseload' electricity, the power that's always on to keep refrigerators running and traffic lights working. Today, America's baseload comes mostly from burning coal or natural gas, both of which emit carbon dioxide, the chief suspect in global warming. 'Solar and wind power cannot even begin to fill the need' for additional electrical power, Fortune magazine opined in May. Bluntly, environmentalists who don't like nuclear power need to offer realistic alternatives."

Detroit News | February 14, 2005

"As natural gas prices continue to escalate and the nation remains handcuffed by the countries that control the lion's share of the world's oil, it's time to seriously consider nuclear power again."

Detroit News | September 26, 2005

"What, then, would be the best solution, using today's technology, to reduce the emission of greenhouse gasses and cut the consumption of fossil fuels? The answer: Go nuclear."

Orlando Sentinel
Portland (ME) Press Herald
Providence (RI) Journal
Raleigh News & Observer
The Roanoke Times
The (Columbia, SC) State
USA Today
Wall Street Journal
The Washington Times
Winston-Salem (NC)Journal

"The need for new refineries and nuclear plants is beyond debate and partisan concerns."

Chicago Sun Times

East Valley Tribune (Scottsdale/Mesa, AZ) | July 13, 2005

On suggestions to the Arizona's global warming panel: "First, strongly recommend that the next nuclear power plant that is built in this country be located in Arizona. With the technological advances of the past 30 years, this is arguable the most environmentally friendly source of energy available."

The Economist | July 7, 2005

"More and more respected voices have been making the case that nuclear energy is essential if the rate of [climate] change is to be slowed. As a result, there is an unlikely alliance between the nuclear industry and many environmentalists, as a growing number of greens have come to believe that nuclear energy is the best way to reduce carbon emissions. Leaders of respected environmental outfits such as Environmental Defense and the World Resources Institute have recently made positive noises about nuclear power as part of a response to global warming. With President Bush and the tree-huggers both on its side, the nuclear industry is back in the game."

Financial Times | February 9, 2005

"Yet there is already a solid case for countries to extend the life of whatever reactors they have. What, for instance, would it profit Britain to generate 20 percent of its power with renewable energy such as wind by 2020, if by around the same date it were to lose exactly the same share of output by taking its reactors out of operation? Greens should ponder this before they go red in the face at nuclear power."

Fort Worth Star-Telegram | May 1, 2005

"America should seek to diversify its energy supply further by developing more advanced and less expensive nuclear power plants."

Grand Rapids Press | May 1, 2005

"Mr. Bush called for a greater federal investment to diversify energy sources: tax credits, for instance, for purchase of gasoline-electric hybrid automobiles and for use of clean-diesel engines. He urged help in stimulating construction of nuclear power plants and oil refineries, in part by locating them at closed military bases."

Greenville (SC) News | March 6, 2005

"Duke Power should feel free to go nuclear. The Upstate's dominant power provider needs to build a new generating plant to meet the growing energy demands of western North Carolina and Upstate South Carolina. Nuclear is among the options. It might be the one that best suits this area."

High Point (NC) Enterprise | July 6, 2005

"A major point in the legislation [Energy Policy Act of 2005] is that it will encourage the construction of nuclear power plants in this nation. Increased production of electricity by nuclear power plants has unlimited potential for making the U.S. energy independent. If the bill contained nothing but provisions that renewed the nation's development of nuclear energy, it would be worth passage."

"If the bill contained nothing but provisions that renewed the nation's development of nuclear energy, it would be worth passage."

High Point Enterprise

The Hill | July 12, 2005

"Nowadays, Americans mainly watch TV on color sets made in Asia. When you turn them on, there's a 1-in-5 chance that the juice will come down the line from one of the nation's 103 operating nuclear power plants – spread across a country that remains the world's top consumer of electricity generated by nuclear fission. Even as Congress continued to debate energy policy, President Bush made the first visit to a nuclear power plant by a chief executive since President Jimmy Carter (a former nuclear engineer) toured Three Mile Island. 'It's time for this country to start building nuclear power plants again,' Bush said."

Huntsville (AL) Times | May 2, 2005

"While Americans are not always comfortable with the idea of nuclear plants, they are not necessarily willing to pay much higher prices for so-called clean energy ... nuclear power deserves a second look."

The Indianapolis Star | July 5, 2005

"Our position is: The nation's energy policy should include new nuclear power plants. Nuclear power, used to generate about 20 percent of the electricity in the United States, has by far the best safety record of any widely used technology. New reactor designs and better training requirements have further reduced the risks. And tests indicate that reactors aren't nearly as vulnerable to terrorist attacks as feared."

Investor's Business Daily | February 16, 2005

"Nuclear power is in fact an environmentally friendly way to solve our energy crisis. Nuclear is the cheapest fuel based on energy content. The large upfront costs of building plants are due largely to delays and regulatory requirements based more on fear than fact. And the relation between 'nuclear' and 'bomb' that's been put in some minds makes about as much sense as one between 'electric' and 'chair.'"

Investor's Business Daily | March 25, 2005

"More than 70 nations agreed with the meeting's closing declaration that nuclear power could 'make a major contribution to meeting energy needs and sustaining the world's development.' Here, finally, is an issue on which we'd be in harmony with our global neighbors. Isn't it time to move ahead with the development of an energy source that's proven both clean *and* safe?"

The Jersey Journal | September 27, 2005

"This nation has shown an unwillingness to experiment or research economically feasible alternative energy. Like France, which has more than 50 working nuclear power plants generating more than 75 percent of its electricity, the United States will be forced to – and should – turn to available technology for its power needs."

Kalamazoo (MI) Gazette | August 16, 2005

"Despite many flaws in the federal government's recently approved energy bill, it supports renewed investment in new nuclear plants. It has been 30 years since the last nuclear power plant was built in the United States."

Manchester (NH) Union Leader | May 19, 2005

"How delicious would it be if the environmentalist panic over global warming helped revive nuclear power? The real gain would come if nuclear power could some day replace the ever-increasing cost and volatility of foreign oil."

"It is therefore critical to keep nuclear power as part of the nation's energy mix."

New York Times

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel | September 26, 2005

"We would argue that a diverse source of supply that includes coal, natural gas and nuclear plants is also important."

Mobile (AL) Register | August 3, 2005

"Alabama officials are smart to pitch the state's unfinished nuclear plant near Scottsboro as the site of a next-generation plant. Alabama needs the jobs and America needs the nuclear energy."

The (McAllen TX) Monitor | July 1, 2005

"No source of energy is without environmental or political downsides. Coming up with a sane, practical energy policy requires carefully weighing the costs and benefits and acting accordingly. Congress and the president should draw up an energy bill that serves the nation's growing energy needs while also protecting the environment as well as the Treasury."

Monticello (MN) Times | January 26, 2005

"On the U.S. scene, nuclear power is charging forward. That nuclear power is thriving around the world (greater utilization, new technologies, proven cost-effectiveness) foreshadows a new day in the United States."

New York Times | May 4, 2005

"It is therefore critical to keep nuclear power as part of the nation's energy mix. None of these concerns [proliferation, used fuel management, higher capital costs than other energy sources] need rule out this promising source of power. But they will need to be addressed forthrightly."

The New Republic | July 4, 2005

"Other provisions [of the Senate energy bill] would make likely, though not certain, the construction of a new generation of safe nuclear reactors. Nuclear power is the sole greenhouse-neutral technology available to produce electricity in large amounts. (Renewable sources, such as wind and solar power, are also greenhouse-neutral, but cannot supply electricity in the sheer quantities that nuclear power can.)"

Portland (ME) Press Herald | April 29, 2005

"Using one standardized [nuclear plant] design will lower construction costs, and making a firm commitment to Yucca Mountain in Nevada as a national waste repository will resolve the waste disposal questions. The United States, which currently imports 58% of its fuel needs, should not be left behind the rest of the world in the race for cleaner skies."

Providence (RI) Journal | May 6, 2005

"For now, there are many questions to be resolved. ... We must answer these difficult questions, yet nuclear energy – we should hope via fusion – would seem at this point to be one of the keys to a great dream: a non-polluting energy future."

Raleigh News & Observer | April 22, 2005

"Meeting a larger share of our power demands with nuclear also would help reduce the country's dependence on overseas supplies of fossil fuel and thus enhance our energy security."

"The real gain would come if nuclear power could some day replace the ever-increasing cost and volatility of foreign oil."

Manchester Union Leader

The Roanoke Times | May 31, 2005

"Confronting such [climate change] danger will require drastic steps. Environmentalists willing to reconsider their long-held bias against nuclear energy recognize that sobering reality. Other special interests also should begin to rethink some of their long-held biases in favor of fossil fuels and join in an earnest, sustained effort to develop alternatives sources of energy – before it is too late."

The (Columbia, SC) State | August 14, 2005

"America needs a broad effort to find cleaner, more secure sources and to waste less of what we have. Meeting future challenges will require ambitious efforts and tough actions. ... On balance, nuclear power's benefits make it one part of the solution."

The Wall Street Journal | July 5, 2005

"Most puzzling is that much of the opposition to nuclear power comes from the left – which, in the U.S. at least, often takes its cue from France – and in particular environmentalists. How the greens can on the one hand rail about fossil fuels' contribution to "global warming" and on the other criticize nuclear reactors that don't emit carbon dioxide is a mystery."

The Washington Times | August 5, 2005

"To enhance America's national security over the long term, it is imperative that the United States expand its use of nuclear power. ... The emission-free benefits of nuclear power, which generates no greenhouse gases and has markedly improved its safety record and efficiency, are too substantial to forego."

Winston-Salem (NC) Journal | July 12, 2005

"As a potential source of nuclear power, fusion has many advantages over the fission plants now in operation around the world. It is cheaper and uses far more abundant fuel. Its waste is also far less dangerous to manage. Fusion, in short, carries the potential to solve the world's energy shortages without creating the greenhouse gases of fossil fuels or the nearly eternal radioactive wastes of fission nuclear plants."

Other Media Commentary

BusinessWeek | March 28, 2005

John Carey

"We'd get a higher payoff, however, by nurturing non-fossil fuel alternatives, including nuclear power."

Chattanooga | April 29, 2005

U.S. Senator Lamar Alexander

"The President also talked about the use of nuclear power. At a time when we are importing nearly 70 percent of our oil and increasingly moving toward importing more of our natural gas, our failure to use more nuclear power is another factor that makes us more dependent on the Middle East and other foreign resources. New nuclear power plants could keep production costs down and keep jobs from moving overseas."

"We are due for a major reconstruction of our thinking about nuclear power."

**Stanley Crouch
New York Daily News**

City Journal | Winter 2005

Peter Huber and Mark P. Mills

"Greens don't want to hear it, but nuclear power makes the most environmental sense, too. Nuclear wastes pose no serious engineering problems. Uranium is such an energy-rich fuel that the actual volume of waste is timely compared with that of other fuels, and is easily converted from its already-stable ceramic form as a fuel into an even more stable glass-like compound, and just as easily deposited in deep geological formations, themselves stable for tens of millions of years."

The Detroit News | July 14, 2005

Mark Perry, professor of finance and economics at University of Michigan-Flint

"It's now up to a U.S. House-Senate conference committee to reconcile the Senate energy bill with one the House has passed. ...There is a better solution—adopting an energy policy that provides economic incentives to build clean-coal technology and nuclear power electric plants in Michigan and elsewhere."

Fortune | May 30, 2005

Geoffrey Colvin, senior editor at large

"But nuclear power is about to start increasing rather than decreasing, and the evidence—today's evidence, not that of 25 years ago—is persuasive that the world will be better off."

Knoxville News Sentinel | May 2, 2005

H. Lee Martin, "Techonomics" columnist

"That brings us to nuclear – and national will. The only realistic alternative for the next 40 years and beyond is nuclear power. Even the politicians are beginning to realize this fact."

Lawrence (KS) Journal-World | April 9, 2005

Dolph Simons Jr., editor-publisher

"There is a lot of talk about solar energy and greater use of the country's vast supply of coal. Unfortunately, there has been far too little discussion of nuclear energy, a low-cost, clean energy source that could fill a large percentage of this nation's energy demand."

New York Daily News | March 21, 2005

Stanley Crouch, columnist, essayist and television commentator

"It is time to recognize what even France understands, which is that nuclear energy is the cleanest, safest and least expensive way to get beyond oil dependency. We are due for a major reconstruction of our thinking about nuclear power."

New York Times | April 9, 2005

Nicholas Kristof, columnist

"A sensible energy plan must encourage conservation – far more than Mr. Bush's plans do – and promote things like hybrid vehicles and hydrogen fuel cells. But for now, nuclear power is the only source that doesn't contribute to global warming and that can quickly become a mainstay of the grid."

"But for now, nuclear power is the only source that doesn't contribute to global warming and that can quickly become a mainstay of the grid."

**Nicholas Kristof
New York Times**

The (Portland) Oregonian | June 16, 2005

David Reinhard, associate editor

"The nuclear industry can point to several advances since the last nuclear power plant came on line or the Three Mile Island fiasco decades ago. Existing plants are more efficient and cost-effective, and designs for the next generation of reactors should make them better and safer still. Never mind the justifiable federal loan guarantees in the Senate bill. Standardized construction plans and a streamlined licensing process should help make nuclear power a more attractive investment."

Orlando Sentinel | June 14, 2005

Bob McGehee, chairman and CEO, Progress Energy

"Our nation has an enormous opportunity for affordable energy and an economic boost by taking a fresh look at nuclear power. The nuclear power industry has been building momentum over the past few years, thanks to superb plant performance and a growing awareness of nuclear energy's role in improving the environment. The industry has achieved outstanding levels of safety and reliability while keeping operating costs low."

Orlando Sentinel | October 11, 2005

Mike Thomas, Columnist

"As a radical environmentalist, I support Progress Energy's plans to build a nuclear power plant in Florida."

Wall Street Journal | May 12, 2005

Gary Becker, Nobel laureate and professor of economics at the University of Chicago

"The excellent safety record at American nuclear plants, growing imports of oil, natural gas and other fossil fuels at high prices, and increased concern over the pollution and global warming caused by fossil fuels, has made the case for reducing regulatory obstacles to new American nuclear power plants compelling."

The Washington Post | April 26, 2005

John Ritch, Director General of the World Nuclear Association and former U.S. ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency

"Humankind cannot conceivably achieve a global clean-energy revolution without a rapid expansion of nuclear power to generate electricity, produce hydrogen for tomorrow's vehicles and drive seawater desalination plants to meet a fast-emerging world water crisis."

"As a radical environmentalist, I support Progress Energy's plans to build a nuclear power plant in Florida."

**Mike Thomas
Orlando Sentinel
Columnist**