

EDITORIALS: NUCLEAR NEEDED TO ADDRESS CLIMATE

As greater attention is paid to climate issues, a growing number of thought leaders are weighing in on effective policy solutions. The urgency of this moment calls for a technology-neutral approach that values all carbon-free sources of power generation—including nuclear—to prevent further impacts from climate change. Top media and media opinion leaders are making the case for nuclear as critical to policy remedies:

**The
New York
Times**

The New York Times:

“These policies could go a long way toward meeting a goal of net zero emissions by midcentury, less than what the Green New Deal calls for but consistent with the recommendations of the United Nations. They could include a national electricity standard utilizing nuclear and carbon capture along with wind and solar; larger (and more consistent) tax incentives for electric vehicles; an infrastructure program that brings serious federal dollars to bear on improving efficiency in buildings and the electrical grid; major efforts to promote the sequestration of carbon in forests, farms and public lands—a critical component, which the Green New Deal recognizes, in any effort to pull carbon from the atmosphere.”

**The
Boston
Globe**

The Boston Globe:

“If [Massachusetts] fails to reach its 2020 emission reduction targets, a big reason will be because of its failure to tap Canadian hydropower earlier. Its reluctance to fully exploit cheap natural gas to displace even dirtier fuels, and the disappearance of two nuclear plants from the region, also hurts. With so many solutions ruled out as too controversial, the state has been unable to make the kind of strategic trade-offs needed for an effective energy policy. ... Compare that with Britain, which has cut emissions more—39.2 percent since 1990, according to the OECD, compared with 27.3 percent in Germany. The British are betting on new nuclear power plants, advancing carbon-capture technology to clean up fossil fuel use, and, instead of fetishizing pipelines, figuring out ways to repurpose them for a low-carbon future.”

**The
Washington
Post**

The Washington Post on Germany’s decision to shut its nuclear plants:

“Spurning a major carbon-free energy source is an irrational indulgence that no nation can afford in the fight against global warming.”

EDITORIALS: NUCLEAR NEEDED TO ADDRESS CLIMATE

Bloomberg

Bloomberg:

“Nonetheless, states can reward nuclear power’s climate advantage in other way—by giving zero-emissions credits for nuclear power, as Illinois, New York and New Jersey have done, or by revising their energy portfolio standards to stop utilities’ switching from nuclear to fossil fuels. ... These and other options need to be on the table as the world wakes up to the role nuclear power must play in avoiding a climate catastrophe.”



New York Magazine (written by Andrew Sullivan):

“What we need, given how little time we have, is a massive nuclear energy program. Sure, we can keep innovating and investing in renewables, and use as much as we can. But they are not going to save us or the planet in time. We know nuclear works and does so quickly.”



Grist:

“Germany provides a cautionary tale for environmental groups. The country implemented what it called an ‘Energiewende’ (energy transition) strategy that prioritized the phase-out of nuclear power over replacing fossil fuels, despite its goal of achieving a low-carbon energy supply. ... Instead, Germany’s rapid deployment of renewable energy has primarily replaced its nuclear power plants.”



Daily Kos:

“But sooner or later, if we’re actually going to achieve this [emissions-free], we’re going to have to make some actual hard and fast decisions on this point and to a lot of people, it looks a lot easier to accomplish a result with nuclear factored in than factored out.”