

Document 1	Document 2	Document 3	Document 4
<b><i>UK electricity power to be powered by clean energy sources from 2035</i></b>	<b>If we want to fight the climate crisis, we must embrace nuclear power</b>	<b>Nuclear energy isn't a safe bet in a warming world</b>	
<b>The Independent, October 2021</b>	<b>The Guardian, August 2021</b>	<b>The Conversation, 28 June 2021</b>	<b>M.Ferran, Mar2021</b>
<b>News article</b>	<b>Opinion piece by Bashkar Sunkara</b>	<b>Opinion piece by Paul Dorfman</b>	<b>A cartoon</b>
<p>-Boris Johnson is planning a complete switch to clean energy sources by 2035 in the UK</p> <p>-Coal and gas will be gradually replaced by wind, solar and nuclear energy within 15 years</p> <p>-Before this announcement, the British gvt had already planned the end of diesel and petrol cars by 2030.</p> <p>-The ultimate goal is net-zero emissions by 2050, to limit the rise in temperature to 1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels.</p> <p>-it will end Britain's dependency on hydrocarbons imports and their fluctuating prices.</p> <p>-Environmentalists deplore that the gvt relies too much on nuclear energy to decarbonise.</p> <p>-Nuclear energy cannot compete with renewables, it is too expensive, its production still relies on outdated large-scale reactors while the future of energy lies in a flexible, decentralised storage of energy.</p> <p>-Nuclear power will slow down the transition to decarbonisation.</p>	<p>-Nuclear plants are currently being closed for safety and/or environmental reasons before being replaced by a cleaner alternative.</p> <p>-In Germany, nuclear plants are replaced by coal plants to meet the country's needs in electricity during the transition period, leading to a rise in carbon emissions.</p> <p>-You need a part of your energy production to be nuclear because it is not dependent on suitable weather, contrary to renewables like solar or wind</p> <p>-There is no reason to keep being so reluctant to nuclear power :</p> <p>-It is wrong to associate nuclear power to nuclear weapons, as we did during the cold war + disasters like Chernobyl are no longer possible, technologically speaking</p> <p>-The amount of nuclear waste has gradually decreased, some of it can be recycled + renewable energies generate polluting waste as well</p> <p>-Nuclear energy requires destructive mining, but so do renewables. The mining industry and its working conditions need to be regulated.</p>	<p>-Because of their need in water supplies to cool off the reactors, 2 in 5 nuclear plants were built in coastal areas, a few metres above sea level, before the effects of climate change were known and visible.</p> <p>-With the rise in sea levels and more frequent storms, these plants are at risk of serious incidents.</p> <p>-The plants built inland are also at risk, because of more frequent extreme weather such as drought, wildfires and flooding.</p> <p>-Such incidents could endanger the lives of the tens of millions of people who live less than 50 miles away from a nuclear plant worldwide.</p> <p>-Nuclear energy is very expensive (building, operating, maintaining the waste)</p> <p>-Building plants that could resist such disasters will be even more expensive.</p> <p>-The risks induced by climate change cannot be predicted</p> <p>-A lot of plants are likely to be closed temporarily or permanently because of climate threats</p> <p>-60% of US nuclear capacity is at risk from threats caused by climate change.</p>	<p>Two fish from Fukushima are discussing.</p> <p>One is saying that the UN declared the disaster had had no significant effect on the wildlife</p> <p>The other fish has 3 eyes, while another one has grown legs.</p> <p>Nobody really knows the effects of nuclear disasters because they are difficult to assess + tempted to turn a blind eye ?</p>