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Ivan Baba and Judit Vasamezyi are leaders of Hungary's growing independent environmentalist movement - and yet they refuse to fight against ***nuclear*** power.

''We need ***nuclear energy***,'' Mr. Baba says. ''There's no public opinion here against it,'' Mrs. Vasamezyi adds.

Their statements suggest that nascent antinuclear movements in the East bloc are unlikely to be mobilized by the Soviet ***nuclear*** disaster. Facing a critical ***energy*** shortage, governments throughout the region see ***nuclear*** power as the only feasible solution.

Hungary is typical. Official press reports limited coverage of the accident to a few paragraphs. Only after neighboring Austria said its radiation levels were above normal did the government admit that Hungary also suffered from ''a slight increase'' in such ***nuclear*** levels.

Even then, officials continued to downplay the Soviet accident, saying no precautions needed to be taken. They explained that the largest amounts of radiation traveled over northern Europe away from the country, and they added that Hungary's own ***nuclear*** plant in Paks is of a later, safer design. Instead of the flammable Chernobyl-type graphite reactor, the Hungarian plant, like most other East European and Western ones, uses pressurized water to slow down the neutrons in the fuel.

''We have taken many more security steps than in the Soviet Union and incorporated many Western design elements,'' assured Joszef Bognar, director of the World Economics Institute. ''This accident won't stop our efforts to develop ***nuclear*** power.''

Hungary needs ***nuclear energy*** to make up an ***energy*** shortage. Like other East European countries, its imported Soviet oil remains expensive, at around $22 a barrel. That price is set at the average of the past five year's world price.

Hungary's main domestic fuel source, also like other East European countries, is low-quality brown coal. It is dirty to burn and getting harder to mine. Throughout the region, coal production has either stabilized or is declining.

''The only solution is ***nuclear*** power,'' says Tibor Laczai Szabo, deputy general director of the Ministry of Industry. Indeed, according to a report prepared by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, ''***nuclear*** power production has been the one bright spot in (East Europe's) ***energy*** picture over the past few years, with output doubling since 1978.'' The CIA says ''three countries - Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and GDR (East Germany) - produce an appreciable share of their electricity from Soviet-designed ***nuclear*** power plants.''

Hungary is catching up fast. According to Mr. Laczai Szabo, the Paks plant already produces 14 percent of Hungary's electricity. With two more blocs under contruction, Laczai Szabo says that figure is planned to grow to 25 percent by 1987. Four additional reactors are planned to be built in the 1990s, meaning that ***nuclear*** power will supply between 40 percent and 50 percent of the nation's electricity by the turn of the century.

With large sums already invested, East-bloc officials refuse to consider canceling ***nuclear*** projects. They say their budgets are too tight. ''The Austrians build a 4 billion schilling ($300 million) ***nuclear*** plant and then stop it from operating,'' marvels Laczai Szabo. ''We don't have that money to waste.''

So unlike democratic Austria, no East-bloc country lets its citizens vote on ***nuclear*** power - or even engage in a public debate. That is one reason Hungarian environmentalists such as Mr. Baba and Mrs. Vasamezyi don't plan to organize an antinuclear movement.

''It's hopeless to oppose ***nuclear*** power here,'' explains Baba. ''***Nuclear*** power is a taboo. It belongs to the most secret of areas in a communist country, and because it is built with help from the Soviet Union, it also means challenging the Soviet Union.''
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the director general of the international atomic ***energy*** agency (iaea) said today the development of ***nuclear energy*** would continue, despite misgivings about its hazards in the aftermath of the chernobyl disaster in the soviet union. dr. hans blix said members of the organization for economic cooperation and development and the soviet union had declared their resolve to move ahead in the ***nuclear*** power field. during a news conference at the vienna international center, blix said the world would need more than saudi arabia's oil production to generate the amount of electricity now being produced by ***nuclear*** plants. ***nuclear energy***, he said, is "one of the substitutes for oil." however, he admitted that in the ***nuclear*** field "one cannot exclude risk," which "cannot go down to zero." but he emphasized he reamins optimistic about ***nuclear*** power's future. blix said he was satisfied with the decisions reached at wednesday's meeting of the 35-nation iaea board. the director general said the next generation of ***nuclear*** power reactors would carry a "greater degree of inherent safety." blix had instructed the agency to prepare a catalogue of possible measures to increase ***nuclear*** safety. these guidelines were used as background for wednesday's meeting. members of the iaea want "additional safety programs without delay" and the agency is working on proposals that will be submitted to the board for its june meeting. artati sudirdjo, chairman of the iaea board, summarized the decisions taken wednesday: -- to convene within three months a post-accident review meeting of experts and submit a report to the iaea board for its september meeting.

-- to establish representative groups of government experts on an urgent basis to draft international agreements, requiring signatories to provide early notification and comprehensive information about ***nuclear*** accidents with possible transboundary effects. -- to direct signatories to coordinate emergency response and assistance in the event of ***nuclear*** accidents which could involve transboundary radiological release. -- to establish an expert working group to consider, over a long period, additional measures to improve cooperation and to upgrade standards in ***nuclear*** safety. -- to convene, under iaea auspices, a conference of governmental representatives to discuss all ***nuclear*** safety issues, including policy. all board members confirmed that before enforcing the proposed agreements, they would provide "prompt notification and information in the event of a ***nuclear*** accident with potential transboundary effects."
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Experts meeting at the OECD's ***Nuclear Energy*** Agency here to discuss the Chernobyl accident, said yesterday that there was no real threat to public health in member countries, and that their ***nuclear*** power plants were basically safe.

The NEA's Committee on the Safety of ***Nuclear*** Installations met experts in radiological protection.

Mr Klaus Stadie, of the NEA, said the committee concluded that 'at this point the accident has caused no significant threat to public health in any OECD countries in comparison to other health risks. ' But further studies would be made when more data were available.

The committee noted that the Chernobyl reactor was different from those used in OECD countries. Some countries represented at the meeting suggested an early information system and the exchange of data between OECD members if a worldwide system could not be set up quickly.

Dr A. Birkhofer, of the Technical University of Munich, said that although the design of the Chernobyl reactor was not known in detail, the building around the reactor had clearly not been proof against pressure or leaks.

A Swedish expert said it was normal practice to take immediate measures according to the highest reading recorded.

Radioactive fallout from the disaster has reached as far as the Philippines, the head of the Philippine Atomic ***Energy*** Commission said in Manila yesterday.
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federal german minister of research heinz riesenhuber said his country cannot shut down ***nuclear*** power plants because the cost would be too great to both the environment and people's health. in an interview with the "bild am sonntag", published today, the minister said that if federal germany replaces ***nuclear*** power plants with coal-burning plants to generate electricity, the atmosphere will receive one million more tons of sulfur and other chemicals which cause acid rain, killing forests and affecting people's health. electricity costs will also go up by 30 percent, he added. riesenhuber's statement coincided with demonstrations across the country calling for the closure of ***nuclear*** power plants. the soviet chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant accident last month, which disseminated radioactive fallout to all of europe, has fanned anti-nulcear sympathies in federal germany. federal germany has about 30 ***nuclear*** power plants either in operation or currently under construction. operational stations generate more than 20 percent of the country's ***energy*** supply. the minister said that federal germany is stepping up research of alternate ***energy*** sources, and the government spends up to 62 million marks (roughly 28.4 million u.s. dollars) every year researching solar ***energy*** alone. despite the efforts, however, power generated by solar ***energy*** and wind would only account for three to six percent of the nation's electricity supply by the year of 2000, riesenhuber said. he called on the nation to save electricity and fuel oil in order to reduce the need to build more ***nuclear*** power plants.
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The Soviet Union relies on ***nuclear*** power for about 10 percent of its ***energy*** needs and Kremlin leaders have outlined an expansion program to more than double ***nuclear*** power output within five years.

There was no official word Tuesday on how the plans might be affected by the disaster reported at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** complex near the Ukrainian capital of Kiev.

Western analysts say the Soviet Union has about 45 ***nuclear*** reactors currently in operation that supply ***energy*** to the Soviet Union and its East European allies.

The United States has 100 operating ***nuclear*** reactors and gets about 15.5 percent of its ***energy*** from ***nuclear*** power.

Soviet leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev said in a February speech that ***nuclear*** power output would be increased at least 2 1/2 times by 1990 and Premier Nikolai I. Ryzhkov has said that ***nuclear*** power will account for more than 20 percent of total ***energy*** production by the end of this decade.

Soviet media do not provide full statistics on ***nuclear*** power production, and protests against ***nuclear*** plant operations are not known to have occurred in Soviet society where expressions of public opinion are strictly controlled.

Public concern about radiation hazards from ***nuclear*** plants was apparent in late 1982, when the labor newspaper Trud published an article citing letters sent by atomic workers and people who live near ***nuclear*** plants.

People asked what precautions were being taken to prevent an accident like that at the Three Mile Island in 1979, which was heavily publicized in the Soviet Union.

In 1983, the Soviet government established a special state committee to oversee safety at ***nuclear*** facilities.

Western ***energy*** experts say the Soviet Union operates mostly light-water cooled reactors that use graphite to slow down neutrons. The reactors usually have no containment structures.

A Soviet ***nuclear*** scientist was quoted in an article in 1983 as saying all four reactors at Chernobyl are of the light-water cooled design. They were completed in 1977, 1978, 1981 and 1983.

The Soviet government claims to have built the first, experimental 5,000-kilowatt power reactor in Obninsk, southwest of Moscow, in July 1954.

The Soviet news agency Tass reported in 1983 that 14 ***nuclear*** power plants were in operation and that 15 were under construction. But it did not say how many reactors were at work at each complex.

Attention has been focused on ***nuclear*** power over the past two decades to make up for declining fossil fuel reserves in the Western part of the country. The nation is the world's largest producer of oil and gas, but oil production has been declining over the past two years and most of the reserves are located in distant Siberia.

The Soviet Union in 1984 agreed to allow outside inspection of some of its civilian ***nuclear*** facilities by the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, but the agency said it had not inspected the Chernobyl complex.
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The West German Chancellor, Dr Helmut Kohl, yesterday initiated a series of diplomatic moves over the Chernobyl accident, but rejected demands from the opposition and the anti-***nuclear*** movement to curtail West Germany's ambitious atomic power programme.

After chairing an emergency cabinet meeting following his return from the Tokyo summit, Dr Kohl announced that he would write a personal letter to the Soviet leader, Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, asking for detailed information on the scale and the causes of the accident.

He also suggested a West German-sponsored conference of the world's 26 ***nuclear energy***-producing countries to agree unified safety standards and called for an emergency meeting next week of the council of governors of the Vienna-based International Atomic ***Energy*** Organisation.

But with the share of ***nuclear energy*** having risen sharply under his Conservative-Liberal Government to 36 per cent of total ***energy*** production in 1985, Dr Kohl ruled out any changes to West Germany's atomic programme.

'The lessons of Chernobyl cannot be that we abandon the use of peaceful ***nuclear energy***. This source of ***energy*** has proved safe, cheap and good for the environment,' he said.

The opposition Social Democrats, meanwhile, who are keen to snatch votes not only from the ruling parties but also from the anti-***nuclear*** Green Party in next January's general election, gave indications yesterday that they would consider amending their ***nuclear*** policy.

The SPD's candidate for Chancellor, Mr Johannes Rau, told a special party conference on economic policy in Hamburg yesterday that he believed in making ***nuclear energy*** 'superfluous in the medium term. '

'The risks of ***nuclear*** power are too great in the long run,' he said.

If he is elected chancellor next year, he will stop the controversial first fast-breeder project in Kalkar, on the Dutch border, he said.

However, in a statement underlining the differences within the SPD over the issue, the party's leader in SchleswigHolstein, Mr Bjoern Engholm, called for an immediate decision on ***nuclear*** power.

'The exit from ***nuclear energy*** must begin today and not in a few years' time,' he said, calling on Mr Rau to produce a timetable for the scrapping of ***nuclear*** power before the elections.

The Social Democrats hope to exploit public anxiety over the risks of ***nuclear*** power in crucial state elections in Lower Saxony next month, which are seen as a rehearsal for the January general election.

However, recent opinion polls have shown that the Greens so far appear to have benefited mast from the Chernobyl debate, with their share of the vote in Lower Saxony not put at over 10 per cent.

The Foreign Office yesterday issued a new phone number - 01-213 6660 - for people planning to travel to Eastern Europe who are concerned about the effect of the Chernobyl disaster on their journey.
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china's ***nuclear energy*** development will enter a new period of practical usage during the seventh five-year plan period (1986-90) and will gradually become the country's second primary ***energy*** source, a chinese ***nuclear*** industry official said here today. chen zhaoming, vice-minister of ***nuclear*** industry, stressed in an exclusive interview with xinhua that china's ***nuclear energy*** will be developed under the principle of safety first and quality first. he revealed that the first phase of the china-designed and built qinshan ***nuclear*** power plant in zhejiang province, which consists of the installation of a 300,000-kilowatt ***nuclear*** reactor, will be completed and begin to generate electricity in 1989. the second phase of the qinshan power plant, which consists of the installation of two 600,000-kw ***nuclear*** reactors, and the construction of the dayawan ***nuclear*** power plant in guangdong province where two 900,000-kw reactors will be installed, will also start during the seventh five-year plan period. upon commission, he said, these two power plants will give an additional electricity generating capacity of 3.3 million kilowatts and are expected to produce 20 billion kwh of electricity a year. "this will help ease china's ***energy*** strain and contribute to the economic development of the eastern part of the country," chen said. he added that china will learn from other countries' experience in developing ***nuclear energy*** and will adopt the pressurized water reactor system in its ***nuclear*** power plants. he said that his ministry will strengthen its work on ***nuclear*** safety measures and standardization, ensure quality in the manufacture and installation of equipment and plant construction as well as training of power plant workers so as to make sure that no ***nuclear*** accidents occur. the vice-minister also revealed that the departments concerned are designing and experimenting with heat-supply systems fueled by ***nuclear energy*** and will try to build a heat-supplying plant during the seventh five-year plan period. at the same time, the ministry will speed up research work on isotopes, electronics and electrical machinery to contribute more to the development of the national economy.
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Sir, - In your report (May 14) on the important debate on ***nuclear energy***, you omitted for your own reasons to tell readers of the radical alternative policies advocated by the Liberal Party.

Perhaps I can quote exactly what I said in the House: "The Liberal Party believes that investment in ***energy*** efficiency, improvements to the environmental acceptability and the efficiency of coal and oil, coupled with the development of alternatives, could meet all our ***energy*** needs and would allow for the gradual changeover to a non-***nuclear energy*** mix.

That is attainable in the UK … this country is not under pressure and has the time to develop a viable, non-***nuclear energy*** policy that would provide the flexibility that we need at an acceptable cost, with minimum environmental risk and maximum public acceptability. That is the course that should be followed. Any responsible British Government would pursue that course."

We know that we cannot stop the ***nuclear*** power programme tomorrow, but we can begin to de-commission the old magnox stations. Nor is the Liberal Party anti-science. On the contrary, we believe our scientists and engineers could make a great contribution to the world if they were give the resources to develop greater ***energy*** efficiency and to advance the role of alternative ***energy*** sources.

I believe this policy is radical and that I am sure the majority of readers will be glad to know that a major political party is advocating such a programme.

Mr Malcolm Bruce MP

(Liberal ***Energy*** Spokesman)

House of Commons

SW1
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A BBC Panorama programme questioning British rules governing safety limits on radiation exposure was 'in almost every critical respect .. wrong' the Environment Minister, Mr William Waldegrave, told the Commons yesterday.

The Government views 'mistakes' made in the programme so seriously that a special briefing document is being circulated to all MPs, Mr Waldegrave said at question time.

The minister's criticism of the panorama programme - screened on May 12 - came after a Labour MP, Mr Frank Cook (Stockton N) asked why British limits on acceptable radiation doses were five times higher than the internationally recommended level.

'I'm afraid you have made the mistake of believing all the things that were in that Panorama programme,' said Mr Waldegrave. 'I'm afraid to say that, in almost every critical respect, that Panorama programme was wrong. '

Mr Cook had suggested that the internationally-agreed limit of one Millisieverts-a-year of artificially produced radiation, compared to a British limit of five Millisievertes-a-year. The United States and West Germany had limits '20 times more stringent,' he told Mr Waldegrave.

But the minister insisted; 'The methods in which we calculate our safe dose limits in this country are differently measured than in the US and Germany. They are tighter here than they are in Germany and equivalent to what they are in the US. '

He added: 'So important is this matter that I am providing for every MP a briefing note on that programme

Mr Waldegrave told Mr John Ward (C. Poole) that there was no danger to Britain from yesterday's radiation incident at the French reprocessing plant at Cape de la Hague, near Cherbourg.

Later, Mr Waldegrave denied that the Government had been involved in any 'cover-up,' after renewed Opposition questioning about an approach to Britain by an International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency official for advice on graphite fires, the day after the Chernobyl disaster.

The Shadow Environment Secretary, Dr John Cunningham, demanded: 'If it's the case that a British official in the IAEA received an inquiry about how to deal with graphite fires from Russia on April 29, why wasn't this information communicated immediately to the British Government?'

It would have made a major difference to the preparedness of this country if the 'potential warning' had been acted upon.

Mr Waldegrave replied: 'I really do think that, though no one doubts the level of heroism and technological competence brought to bear by the Russians on this tragedy, if any Government has to answer questions about cover-ups it is not the British Government. '
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One of the ***nuclear*** industry's biggest congressional boosters, Rep. John McCain, R-Ariz., sees some opportunity now to advance licensing reform on Capitol Hill, although he adds that chances might be modest at best.

"There's a window of opportunity," McCain told the Atomic Industrial Forum in Scottsdale, Ariz., last week. "It's not large, but it does exist."

McCain cited recent efforts by a majority of the members of the House ***Energy*** subcommittee on ***energy*** conservation and power to prevail upon their chairman, Rep. Edward Markey, D-Mass., for a markup of licensing legislation (*IE/FL,* 31 March, 1.) The Arizonan, a member of the House Interior Committee, also said the chairman of that panel, Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz., and the next ranking Democrat, Rep. John Seiberling, D-Ohio, have appeared amenable to taking up the issue.

And, McCain said, the new chairman of the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission, Lando Zech, could help advance the licensing issue more than did his predecessor, Nunzio Palladino. Zech, said McCain, with no slap at Palladino intended, "is much more of a take-charge guy."

But McCain warned that industry unity, especially on standardization, is essential if the congressional opportunity is to be seized. "If you are separated on any parts of the legislation, you will be picked apart by the critics," he said.

The Arizonan also was optimistic that Congress will extend the Price-Anderson insurance bill in a way that will provide $2 billion to $3 billion in a pool to cover accidents without "crippling" the industry.

At the same session, E. T. Papay, a member of an ***Energy*** Research Advisory Board panel probing the government's role in promoting ***nuclear energy***, said that DOE has to lead the industry out of its doldrums. "***Energy*** Secretary [John] Herrington tells us that he and President Reagan are 'irrevocably' committed to ***nuclear energy*** as an option for the future," Papay, a senior vice president for Southern California Edison Co., said. "Well, the future is now, and if we are going to expand the use of ***nuclear*** power, we need clear programs, plans and policies."

Papay said that formal recommendations are to be submitted to ERAB in May. Some study group members have been concerned over cutbacks in ***nuclear*** r&d proposed by DOE for FY-87 -- cuts not anticipated when the group began its work last fall -- and may want to study that issue further before May, he said.

Among proposals made by the three panel subgroups (on light water reactors, advanced technology, and institutional factors) is the establishment of a standing task force, probably headed by DOE, to serve as a "focal point" for government initiatives in ***nuclear energy***, he said. Replacement of the five-person NRC with one administrator also has been urged, he said.

"The need for a national commitment to ***nuclear energy*** is definitely our highest hurdle," Papay said. "After all, to what extent should a utility invest in a technology that is not supported and nurtured by its own government, and for that matter, why should the public have faith in such a technology?"

[*http://www.platts.com*](http://www.platts.com)
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***Energy*** Secretary John Herrington said last week that the long-vacant positions of assistant secretary for ***nuclear energy*** and fossil ***energy*** will soon be filled.

*Inside* ***Energy****/with Federal Lands* has learned that the White House is poised to announce the nomination of A. David Rossin as the new assistant secretary for ***nuclear energy***. Sources indicated the announcement could come as early as this week. Rossin is director of the Electric Power Research Institute's ***nuclear*** safety analysis center. His candidacy for the job has gotten a mixed reaction from ***nuclear*** observers because of his outspokenness. He was director of research for Commonwealth Edison Co. in Chicago from 1972 to 1981.

In addition, *IE/FL* has been told by informed administration sources that Robert Price, former executive vice-president of the National Coal Assn., is the leading candidate to be DOE's next assistant secretary for fossil ***energy***. Price would be the third person to serve in that post during the Reagan administration. The last person to hold the job was William Vaughan, who resigned last year.

Rossin is a 27-year veteran of the ***nuclear*** power field, having held a variety of technical and managerial positions at Argonne National Laboratory. He has expertise in reactor engineering, reactor safety, radiation shielding, radiation effects on materials and environmental impact evaluation. He would be the second person to serve in that post for the Reagan team. The position has been vacant for sixteen months since Shelby Brewer resigned.

Price, an attorney, is now president and chief executive officer of Continental ***Energy*** Resources, Inc., in Denver, an independent oil-and-gas exploration firm. He spent 11 years doing government relations work in Washington for NCA. He also served at the Federal Power Commission and Federal Trade Commission.

At a briefing last week, Herrington disclosed that the nomination process for candidates to fill the two posts is well under way. "The ***nuclear energy*** secretary is decided by the president, in clearance and we expect it to come out of FBI check any day and be forwarded to the Hill. That is imminent, I am positive. He has been in clearance probably close to six weeks. The fossil candidate is already decided, and that name has been approved by the president and that is in clearance trailing the ***nuclear*** [nominee]. Those two appointments are well down the line," Herrington said.

In related news, the Senate ***Energy*** Committee has scheduled confirmation hearings on April 14 for two other key DOE nominations -- William Martin, to be deputy secretary, and David Waller, to be assistant secretary for international affairs.

[*http://www.platts.com*](http://www.platts.com)

**End of Document**



[***Poll Says Public Faith in Nuclear Power Shaken***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3SJD-KBS0-0011-852K-00000-00&context=1516831)

The Associated Press

May 10, 1986, Saturday, AM cycle

Copyright 1986 Associated Press  All Rights Reserved

**Section:** Domestic News

**Length:** 208 words

**Dateline:** WASHINGTON

**Body**

Americans' faith in ***nuclear energy*** was shaken more deeply by the Chernobyl disaster than the 1979 accident at Three Mile Island, according to a poll released Saturday.

The percentage of adults who oppose construction of new ***nuclear*** power plants jumped to 52 percent, from 29 percent who supported a construction freeze after the Pennsylvania accident, according to the poll conducted by the Roper Organization for U.S. News & World Report and the Cable News Network.

Fifty-two percent of those polled also said the Chernobyl accident "shows the inherent danger of ***nuclear*** power in all countries," while 34 percent said it showed only a weakness in the Soviet system.

Nearly seven of 10 said the Soviet ***nuclear*** problems and recent setbacks in the U.S. space program represented the inevitable "price of progress." But those polled, by a 2-to-1 ratio, said the risks in space were more acceptable than those linked to ***nuclear energy***.

"With the space shuttle, you don't have the survival of the human race at risk," one respondent said.

The poll is the first in a series of joint surveys taken by the two news organizations. Roper conducted random telephone interviews with 1,003 adults on May 7 and 8. The survey has a margin of error of 4 percentage points.
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***Energy*** experts predicted yesterday that public concern arising from the Soviet ***nuclear*** accident would tip the scales against orders for new ***nuclear*** power reactors in many countries.

Even before the radioactive dust flung skyward by a burning Soviet reactor has settled, new fears about the safety of ***nuclear*** power are being voiced around the world.

Students of the ***nuclear*** industry said that some countries, especially France and Japan, would probably forge ahead with plans to expand ***nuclear energy*** despite the Soviet disaster, both because they believe their technologies to be safe and because they face little serious public opposition.

But experts predicted that construction of new ***nuclear*** plants would be curtailed elsewhere.

In Western Europe, the Soviet disaster has added new kindling to already fiery debates about the future of ***nuclear*** power. With the exception of France, the ***nuclear*** industry in Western Europe has been stagnating, with little new construction and few orders for future plants.

A Slackening of Demand

The industry's woes have been attributed to economic factors, including a slackening of projected electrical demand and high interest rates as well as a surge in public concern about safety in the wake of the 1979 accident at Three Mile Island, in Pennsylvania.

Now, in the shadow of a far worse accident that has sprinkled several countries with radioactive fallout, Western European opposition to ***nuclear energy*** seems certain to widen and deepen, experts believe.

''In Europe outside France, the effect on future reactor orders is going to be paralyzing,'' said Andrew Holmes, editor of European ***Energy*** Report, a newsletter published in London.

''This accident will make it far more difficult for new plants to be built,'' said David Albright, a ***nuclear*** specialist at the Federation of American Scientists in Washington.

A Positive View of Prospects

But a spokesman for the American ***nuclear*** power industry expressed a more positive view.

''I don't think the Soviet accident will sharply reduce the growth of ***nuclear*** power,'' said Eugene Gantzhorn of the Atomic Industrial Forum in New York.

He noted that nearly all commercial reactors in other countries used a safer technology than the Soviet plant, which has graphite core reactors that are seldom built in the West and lack containment buildings to deter the escape of radiation.

''I believe common sense will prevail, and this will not stop needed ***nuclear*** power programs around the world,'' Mr. Gantzhorn said. ***Nuclear*** power now provides 15 percent of the world's electricity.

Mr. Holmes, speaking by telephone, predicted that the Soviet accident might derail ***nuclear*** plans in four countries that were on the verge of ordering new reactors - the Netherlands, Italy, Finland and Britain.

He said the accident had strengthened opponents of ***nuclear energy*** in additional countries, including West Germany and Switzerland. He said the accident could slow the planned expansion, with Soviet assistance, of ***nuclear energy*** in Eastern Europe, a region lacking in domestic ***energy*** resources.

East European Voices Concern

Yesterday an East European diplomat observed that a plant identical to the stricken Chernobyl station was under construction in his country.

''What are we supposed to do now?'' the diplomat asked in frustration. He said some East European countries had formed committees to examine the implications of the Soviet disaster for their own ***energy*** futures.

The Soviet Union has laid plans to more than double ***nuclear energy*** output in the next five years, to nearly 70,000 megawatts, from 28,000 megawatts in operation at the end of 1985.

Soviet ***energy*** planners consider the growth of ***nuclear*** capacity essential in the European regions of their country, which are getting short on fossil fuel sources, and Western experts declined to speculate about how Moscow's staunchly pro-***nuclear*** policy might be affected by the Chernobyl disaster.

Three European countries have rejected ***nuclear*** power in recent years. In 1978, Austria decided not to open an already built reactor, while Sweden, after the Three Mile Island incident, decided to phase out its 10 existing reactors by 2010. Last year Denmark decided to forgo the ***nuclear*** option.

German Debate Intensifies

In West Germany, which depends on ***nuclear*** reactors for about a third of its electricity, this week's disaster intensifed a debate over ***nuclear*** power. On Wednesday, the Green Party renewed its antinuclear campaign at a news conference, displaying signs reading, ''Chernobyl Is Everywhere,'' evoking signs held by demonstrators after the Three Mile Island accident that said ''Harrisburg Is Everywhere.''

The West German Government said the Soviet accident would have no effect on plans to add five more reactors to the 20 already operating. But some observers predicted that the antinuclear forces, especially vocal in the 1970's, would be strengthened anew.

***Nuclear*** power development in Britain has been stalled for years by a debate over what type of, if any, new reactors should be built. At a minimum, the Soviet accident appeared likely to delay still longer an awaited decision by the Government, after three years of hearings and debate, over whether to build Britain's first pressurized water reactor, a Westinghouse model that is a departure from previously built gas-cooled reactors.

***Nuclear*** reactors are also manufactured by General Electric, Babcock & Wilcox and Combustion Engineering of the United States; Siemens-Kraftwerk Union of West Germany, Framatome of France, British General Electric, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries of Japan and Atomic ***Energy*** of Canada Ltd., as well as by the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Britain Affirms Its Policy

An official in the Prime Minister's office said it was ''ludicrous'' to suggest that British ***energy*** policy would be deflected by the Soviet accident, but opponents of ***nuclear*** power are mounting new protests.

''I think this may have tipped the balance against ***nuclear*** development here,'' said Mr. Holmes, the London ***energy*** analyst.

France has been opening reactors at a rate of four a year, but the pace of construction is expected to slow, not because of qualms about the technology but because reactors already under construction are expected to meet most of the projected electricity needs. France derives nearly two-thirds of its electricity from ***nuclear*** power.

The Soviet accident ''is not leading us to change our activities or policies,'' Michel Lajus, head of a Government committee on ***nuclear*** safety said this week. Effective public opposition has not emerged.

Japan Is One-Fourth ***Nuclear***

Japan now gains more than a quarter of its electricity from 32 ***nuclear*** reactors. Eleven more are under construction and six others are planned. Opponents of ***nuclear*** power wield little political influence and experts doubted whether the Chernobyl disaster would slow the push for more ***nuclear energy*** in Japan, which is totally dependent on imports for oil.
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Poland will be reviewing all safety procedures and equipment planned for its first 1,680 MW ***nuclear*** power station under construction at Zarnowiec on the Baltic as a result of the Chernobyl accident, Mr Jerry Urban, the government spokesman said yesterday.

He was replying to questions following a letter to parliament from nearly 3,000 inhabitants of the north-eastern city Bialystok which lay in the path of the radio-active cloud.

They have demanded that work on the Zarnowiec site be halted until adequate safeguards are provided.

Mr Urban also did not rule out the need to import additional safety equipment from outside Comecon countries when he said that Poland would be considering every kind of safeguards "from all over the world."

The mining and ***energy*** minister, Czeslaw Piotrowski, has also received an open letter signed by five ***nuclear*** scientists calling for a containment shell to be built at Zarnowiec similar to those used in the west.

The Zarnowiec plant is a pressurised water reactor, built to Soviet design, and quite different from the Chernobyl graphite moderated plant, Mr Urban stressed. He added that abandonment of Poland's ***nuclear energy*** programme would lead to economic stagnation. His tone in replying to the protests was markedly moderate, a sign that the authorities recognise the intense fears about ***nuclear energy*** that the Chernobyl accident has raised in Poland.
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As many as 60 per cent of Swedes would vote against ***nuclear*** power if the country were to hold a new referendum on the issue according to an opinion poll taken in the wake of the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** diaaster in the Soviet Union.

In a referendum held in 1980, 38.6 per cent of Swedes wanted a rapid phasing out of ***nuclear*** power by 1985.

Sweden is the only country in the world with a major ***nuclear*** power industry which is committed to phasing out ***nuclear energy***. ***Nuclear*** power accounts for close to 50 per cent of Swedish electricity generation, but the Government is committed by the 1980 referendum to closing down the country's 12 reactors by the year 2010.

According to the opinion poll conducted by Sifo, the Swedish opinion research institute, only 26 per cent of Swedes would not vote in favour of ***nuclear*** power with 13 per cent undecided.

Resistance to ***nuclear*** power is particularly strong among women, where three out of four are now opposed to ***nuclear energy***.

In a poll taken five years ago, one year after the referendum, Swedes were almost equally divided in their views with 45 per cent in favour of ***nuclear*** power and 42 per cent against.

The ***nuclear*** power debate, which raged in Sweden during the second half of the 1970s and which led directly to the downfall of one government, has inevitably been rekindled by the Chernobyl disaster.
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The Soviet ***nuclear*** disaster ''has shaken American faith'' in atomic ***energy*** more profoundly than the 1979 accident at Three Mile Island, a survey released Saturday said.

The poll commissioned by Cable News Network and U.S. News & World Report said 52 percent of American adults believe the meltdown and explosion at the Chernobyl reactor in the Soviet Ukraine ''shows the inherent danger of ***nuclear*** power in all countries.''

Fifty-two percent also oppose construction of any new atomic power plants, the poll said.

The survey said those figures represent a sharp increase from the 29 percent of adults who recommended a freeze on ***nuclear*** plant construction after the 1979 partial meltdown at the Harriburg, Pa., plant.

''The accident at the Soviet Union's Chernobyl reactor has shaken American faith in ***nuclear energy*** more deeply than Three Mile Island,'' said a release accompanying the poll.

''Almost seven out of 10 attributed the Soviet ***nuclear*** problems and recent setbacks in the U.S. space program to the inevitable accidents that are part of the 'price of progress,''' the release said.

''Yet when asked what risks are most acceptable, Americans by better than a 2-1 ratio accepted the risks in space rather than ***nuclear energy***. Said one: 'With the shuttle, you don't have the survival of the human race at stake.'''

The poll was conducted by the Roper Organization of 1,003 adults interviewed at random by telephone Wednesday and Thursday.

The survey has a 4 percent margin of error.
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Premier David Peterson said, however, that he is prepared to examine

Ontario's growing dependence on ***nuclear energy***, a reliance that could have

the province obtaining nearly 70 per cent of its future power needs from

***nuclear*** plants.

''It appears that this is the most significant problem the ***nuclear***

industry has seen in the world and that there is going to be a very strong

reaction (to it), both intellectually and emotionally," the Premier said

outside the Legislature. ''It is certainly going to put the ***nuclear***

industry under some siege."

But he said he has been told by experts that the Soviet and Ontario

systems are vastly different in their design and safety components and

''there is no reason to fear in Ontario at the present time."

In press conferences, Ontario Hydro and Atomic ***Energy*** of Canada Ltd.

also emphasized the differences between ***nuclear*** plants in the two

countries.

The Legislature received the news of the disaster in the Soviet Ukraine

with unusual solemnity.

The New Democrats demanded a more complete review of the province's

***nuclear*** future, particularly the new $11-billion plant at Darlington,

nearly 80 per cent complete and awaiting the final go-ahead from the

Liberal Cabinet for several months now.

''Soviet scientists, I'm sure, were telling Soviet authorities that

their system was failsafe as well," NDP Leader Bob Rae said in the

Legislature.

''It is time we reflected long and hard on the implications" of being

so dependent on ***nuclear energy***, he said. ''We now realize - and perhaps

this tragedy brings it home in a way that unfortunately nothing else could

- there are limits to man's knowledge, limits to our expertise.

''The technological arrogance of a world view that might have been

appropriate in the 1950s and even the 1960s is singularly inappropriate

for us as a province today in the 1980s," he added.

Opposition Leader Larry Grossman said the Soviet disaster gives the

Government time to re-examine its priorities and perhaps learn from this

experience.

Ontario's ***nuclear*** power systems are based on what is considered non-

flammable heavy water and a series of other safety precautions more

elaborate than those used by the Soviets, Ontario Hydro officials said.

They added, however, that the Soviets were so confident of their own new

safety devices that they built apartment buildings adjacent to the reactor

site.

Mr. Peterson said that while the Soviet disaster will undoubtedly

create some general paranoia about ***nuclear energy***, he does not expect it

to affect the Government's impending decision on Darlington.

The Liberals are looking at Darlington from a cost and not a safety

perspective, he said. The Government has already announced it wants to see

Hydro moderate its power mix somewhat in the future by placing renewed

emphasis on conservation and small-scale hydro plants.
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Mr Leonid Zamyatin, the new Soviet ambassador to London, said yesterday that the proposal made on Wednesday by Mr Mikhail Gorbachev for a special US-Soviet summit on ending ***nuclear*** tests did not exclude a subsequent summit on more general subjects.

At his first news conference since assuming his post two weeks ago, Mr Zamyatin said that Moscow was quite ready to fulfil the agreements made by President Ronald Reagan and Mr Gorbachev at their Geneva meeting last November.

That included another summit meeting.

He did not suggest, however, any date for the main US-Soviet summit, which Washington has said cannot be held before the November mid-term elections in the US.

Mr Zamyatin underlined once again the Soviet position that the second meeting between Mr Reagan and Mr Gorbachev should not be just another "getting acquainted" session, but should lead to specific agreements, particularly on halting the ***nuclear*** arms race.

Explaining Mr Gorbachev's proposal for a separate early summit on a ***nuclear*** tests moratorium, Mr Zamyatin said that the Chernobyl disaster had underlined the inherent dangers involved in the use of ***nuclear energy***.

"What happened at Chernobyl strengthened our conviction that the course taken by us was the only correct one to follow - ridding our planet of ***nuclear*** weapons, safe utilisation of ***nuclear energy*** for peaceful, constructive purposes only, and a call for international co-operation."

Mr Zamyatin went out of his way to thank Britain for the protective suits it had sent to the Soviet Union.
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Dr Hans Blix, Director General of the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, yesterday called for an early international conference to discuss ***nuclear*** safety and made a strong plea to governments to give the agency greater powers to expand its programme on safety.

Speaking at the special meeting of the agency's board of governors in Vienna, Dr Blix said: "The agency needs to adopt a comprehensive additional programme on safety and to do so without delay."

Yesterday's meeting was called at the request of West Germany to discuss the implication of the accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant in the Soviet Union last month.

Mr Boris Semionov, Deputy Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for ***Nuclear Energy***, told delegates that the number of people who had died as a result of the accident was now 15. Asked to comment on whether some experiments were being carried out in the reactor at the time of the accident, Mr Semionov said: "I am not prepared to answer this question right now."

Dr Blix, in a speech that was well received by many delegates, outlined a long list of measures - emergency and long-term - that the Agency could undertake to reasure public opinion about ***nuclear*** safety and to improve international co-operation and the flow of information between states in the case of accidents.

But first he said it was important that there was a full and detailed analysis of the accident and its causes. The Soviet authorities supported that, he said. A special meeting of the IAEA could take place before the summer to carry out such a post-mortem.

He called for a special conference to discuss measures to improve safety and, in particular, the establishment of an early warning system in the case of accident and emergency assistance. That should take place as soon as possible, he said.

Dr Blix suggested that such a conference could take place immediately after the agency's general conference in September. Its task would be to examine and adopt multilateral agreements covering the establishment of an early warning system and emergency assistance.

It should be open to the agency's full membership and to other relevant international organisations. A date could be set by the next meeting of the agency's board of governors in June.

He suggested an improved system of reporting range of activity levels through the establishment of a focal point, which would then pass on the information to other countries.

In a carefully worded statement regarding suggestions on establishing binding international standards for ***nuclear*** safety, Dr Blix suggested that governments could examine whether such binding minimum standards could realistically be worked out.

A less ambitious alternative, he said, would be to see if the existing criteria, under ***nuclear*** safety standards rules, would be transformed into mandatory minimum plans.

Dr Blix suggested that it was important for the ***nuclear*** industry and ***nuclear energy*** to reassure public opinion and demonstrate that ***nuclear energy*** can be developed safely.
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The ***nuclear*** disaster in the Soviet Union could seriously set back efforts to license the Shoreham ***nuclear*** power plant, according to supporters and opponents of ***nuclear energy***.

''I don't see how they could license Shoreham at this point,'' said Maurice Barbash, the Suffolk County builder who heads Citizens to Replace Lilco, an organization opposing both Shoreham and its owner, the Long Island Lighting Company. ''It would be the height of insanity.''

Scott Peters, a spokesman for the Atomic Industrial Forum, a ***nuclear-energy*** trade association, cautioned that reports of the Soviet accident remain sketchy. But he acknowledged that the accident ''is going to raise sensitivity about the safety issue.''

And Representative Edward J. Markey, a Massachusetts Democrat who is the chairman of the ***Energy*** Conservation and Power subcommittee, predicted that the accident would have ''implications for all ***nuclear*** power plants, including Shoreham.''

Evacuation Plan Tested

James Blew, director of Citizens for Shoreham Electricity, said that the Soviet accident was not relevant to the Shoreham debate, because of the fundamentally different safety standards in the two countries. ''But you've got to admit it may have an impact on public attitudes,'' he said.

Until the Soviet disaster, the $4.5 billion plant appeared to be making steady progress toward getting a commercial operating license from the Federal ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission.

Shoreham recently completed the last major stage in the license-application procedure, the testing of an emergency evacuation plan in case of a serious ***nuclear*** accident. But New York State and Suffolk County officials refused to participate in the drill, saying no emergency plan would work, given Long Island's dense population, restrictive geography and limited road network.

''Until now, the NRC and the utilities - Lilco in particular - have dealt with emergency planning as sort of a pointless exercise,'' Nora Bredes, executive coordinator of the Shoreham Opponents Coalition, said. ''What the Soviet tragedy says is that the worst can happen and any community that cannot offer that last fail-safe system should not have a ***nuclear*** plant in its midst.''

Public Mood Seen Shifting

Even if the commission does grant Shoreham a license, that decision is sure to be challenged in the courts. And within that forum, said Charles Komanoff, a New York-based ***nuclear energy*** consultant, shifts in the public mood resulting from the Soviet disaster may have a more powerful impact.

Lilco spokesmen and others stress differences in technology between American ***nuclear*** power plants and those in the Soviet Union.

The containment structure at Shoreham is a 135-foot-high building of steel-reinforced concrete, between four feet and seven feet thick, enclosing the reactor.

Reactors like the one at Shoreham differ from the damaged one in Chernobyl in the Ukraine in their use of water to control the chain reaction in the reactor. Unlike water, graphite can burn and there have been reports of a graphite fire at the Chernobyl plant.
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The Soviet ***nuclear*** accident at Chernobyl has shaken Americans' faith in ***nuclear energy*** more deeply than the Three Mile Island accident of 1979, according to a poll for U.S. News & World Report and the Cable News Network by the Roper Organization.

The poll was conducted on May 7 and 8.

Fifty-two percent of adults oppose building new ***nuclear*** plants, up from 29 percent after the mishap in Pennsylvania. Approval of ***nuclear*** power has dropped from 53 percent to 45 percent.

Behind concern lies a belief that the Soviet meltdown illustrates the "inherent danger of ***nuclear*** power" rather than weaknesses in Soviet engineering. Four out of 5 now support 24-hour federal inspectors at ***nuclear*** plants. Twenty-eight percent favor a permanent shutdown of existing plants, up from 14 percent.

Almost 7 out of 10 people attributed the Chernobyl accident and setbacks in the U.S. space program to accidents that are part of the "price of progress." Yet when asked what risks were acceptable, Americans by better than a 2 to 1 ratio accepted risks in space rather than from ***nuclear energy***. Said one: "With the space shuttle, you don't have the survival of the human race at risk."

Here are key results:

Would you favor not permitting any more new ***nuclear*** power plants to be built? Favor: 52% Oppose: 38%

Do you think the Soviet ***nuclear***-power-plant accidents shows the inherent danger of ***nuclear*** power in all countries or only weaknesses in the Soviet Union? Inherent dangers: 52% Only Soviet weaknesses: 34% Both: 2%

Random telephone survey of 1,003 adults was conducted May 7 and May 8. Margin of error is 4 percent. Results do not add to 100 percent because of deletion of "don't knows."
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Morocco's ***nuclear energy*** program is beginning to emerge from the incubator. Construction is to start this year on the country's first research and training reactor, and in the next year or so, negotiations will commence with reactor vendors for supply of Morocco's first ***nuclear*** power plant. "We are now in touch with all the suppliers -- European, east European and North American," said an official of the Office National de l'Electricite (ONE). East European, he explained, meant the Soviet Union, which "has indicated that they are very interested. They have contacted us officially and said that they are ready to offer their technology, and have already supplied us with technical information," the official said in an interview with Nucleonics Week last month.

By 1987-1988, site and feasibility studies for the first ***nuclear*** power plant should be completed. These studies are being carried out for ONE by Sofratome of France under a contract signed in June 1983 and effective since June 1984, and in consultation with the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency. Aerial and ground surveys have been made of the area between Bir Jdid (near Casablanca) and Essaouira on the Atlantic coast, Morocco's "industrial belt." Seven possible sites have been identified, two of which are undergoing detailed study. Both are located between Safi and Essaouri.

The time schedule for connecting the first ***nuclear*** plant to the grid was stretched out recently by some five years to around 2002-2003. "The global recession is holding up everything," said the ONE official. Electricity demand growth has slowed, and planned grid development has slipped behind schedule. Fifty-seven percent of the population is rural and accounts for only 6% of total electricity consumption, and only 60% of Moroccan townships are electrified. The average annual rate of consumption growth has dropped from 10% to 8% in the last 10 years, with a sharp dip to 3.5% in 1984, owing largely to supply constraints and rationing at the height of a five-year drought. Long-term projections have now been revised downwards from 9% to 7% per annum, with total consumption projected to rise from 6.5-billion kilowatt-hours (KWH) at present to 9.15-billion KWH in 1990, 12.8-billion KWH in 1995, 18-billion KWH in 2000, and 25-billion KWH in 2005.

At present, 70% of electricity on the ONE grid is produced by oil-fired plants, creating massive dependence on oil imports. But even with maximal development of conventional domestic resources, ONE is faced with a book deficit of 12-billion KWH by the year 2000 and 19-billion KWH by 2005. Domestic hydro, coal, and natural gas resources are estimated capable of yielding only 6-billion KWH by 2000-2005. While ONE has active renewable-***energy*** and shale oil development programs, the main choice is seen to be between ***nuclear energy*** and imported coal or a mix of the two. Feasibility studies for four 300-MW imported coal plants are currently underway, and two 150-MW oil-fired plants are being converted to burn imported coal.

Initially, the estimated 9-million metric tons (MT) of uranium reserves-contained in Morocco's extensive phosphate rock deposits was a major argument in favor of ***nuclear*** power development. However, the great depression in uranium prices, coupled with drops in coal and oil prices, has forced a reappraisal of the linkage between the uranium extraction program and the ***nuclear energy*** program, according to M. Bouhaouli, director of ***energy*** in the Ministry for ***Energy*** & Mines. Commercial uranium extraction from phosphoric acid was originally scheduled to start in 1985 with the commissioning of a unit processing 210 MT/year of uranium concentrate at the Safi chemical complex, but that has been shelved indefinitely. Although commissioning of the Jorg Lasfar phosphate complex will boost Moroccan phosphoric acid output to 2- to 8-million MT this year, at present there are no plans to recover the estimated 130-150 grams uranium per MT it would yield, Bouhaouli said. "The economic conditions for the two (programs) are different and maybe (even) at odds with each other. . . . Our uranium extraction program is not interconnected with the ***nuclear energy*** program. . . because at this point we don't know which technologies will be used or when." Nevertheless, he added, "The availability of domestic uranium is an extra plus for the ***nuclear energy*** program."

IF ONE should adopt an "extreme-case" all-***nuclear*** scenario for meeting electricity demand past 2000, three or four units of the 600-MW class could go into operation between 2002 and 2005, given the projected growth in capacity of the national grid (3,000 megawatts in 2000 and 4,200 MW in 2005). It is estimated that a full 15 years will be needed to get the first plant in operation, so it could not be in operation before 2000. This allows 4-5 years for studies (1984-1988), 2-3 years for negotiations with suppliers, contracting, and arranging finances, and 7-8 or more years for construction.

Other scenarios basically involve different mixes of ***nuclear*** with coal plants, partly to diversify ***energy*** sources but mainly to cushion the "financial shocks" characteristic of ***nuclear*** power plants in their initial years of operation. Similarly, various options for fuel supply are under study at ONE, ranging from reliance on domestic uranium and "reasonable" development of domestic fuel cycle facilities, to reliance on purchase of fabricated fuel abroad with or without parallel development of domestic uranium extraction for export. "It's a political as well as an economic choice. The two considerations are married here. We expect to have the elements for a decision on this in 2-3 years' time," the ONE official said.

The Sofratome study embraces all available reactor technologies and is not restricted to any one, such as the French. This reflects another shift in approach. "Initially we intended to decide on reactor technology before calling for tenders. Now we plan to make the choice through the tender process. Basically, it was a political decision to commission Sofratome to do the feasibility studies, but our options are completely open," the official said.

The first unit is expected to be of the "standard" 600-MW class, but could reach 900 MW if that proved economically feasible. The possibility of a 300-MW reactor was virtually ruled out from the start. "Why choose a 300 MW, which has so little experience behind it and is produced by only so few vendors? We want an open tender, to have maximal choice. Besides, in 15 years, our grid will be able to accept a 600-MW (plant)," the official said.

Components for the Triga Mark I research reactor, contracted with GA Technologies of the U.S. in 1983, are already in the delivery process, Bouhaouli said. It will be erected this year in the National Center for ***Nuclear Energy***, Science & Technology in the capital city, Rabat. Site and design studies are being completed by Electrowatt of Switzerland. The initial core and one reload are being supplied by the U.S. government under an aid agreement, he said.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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Britain's ***nuclear energy*** programme was subjected to critical scrutiny yesterday by members of the Commons ***Energy*** Committee anxious to test official reactions to the Soviet power station disaster.

Conservative and Labour members of the committee claimed that the Department of ***Energy*** was funding a disproportionate amount of research on ***nuclear*** power compared with coal, renewable forms of ***energy*** and conservation technology.

They made their charges as senior ***Energy*** Department officials presented evidence on research and development spending in the supplementary estimates for 1986-87.

Mr Tony Speller, a Conservative MP, accused the department of appearing "totally involved in ***nuclear energy***" and not interested in other forms. Mr William O'Brien, a Labour member of the committee, said that, compared with the scale of Government-funded research on ***nuclear*** power, coal was treated "like a starving child."

Out of the 277 m Pounds (pds) R & D budget this year, 100 m pds will be spent on the fast-breeder reactor project and more than 20 m pds on ***nuclear*** fission. Little more than 1 m pds is to be spent by the department on coal research.

Mr Peter Gregson, the department's permanent secretary, replied that the Government spent proportionately more on ***nuclear*** research than on coal because R & D on the latter was being funded by the coal, electricity and gas industries.

It was up to the Government, however, to finance long-term R & D on fast-breeder and fission projects.

Replying to Mr Ted Leadbitter (Lab), who accused him of giving "Foreign Office answers," Mr Gregson said safety was the main purpose of the 22 m pds to be spent by the department this year on gas and water-cooled reactors and on general radiological protection programmes.

The Government, he added, would "look carefully" into the Chernobyl accident before deciding whether it was necessary to spend more on direct research into the safety aspects of ***nuclear*** power.
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Two spectacular sets of accidents this year are bringing gradual but possibly far-reaching changes in the international climate. Initial reaction to Chernobyl and the series of American space launch disasters focused on causes and remedies.

But it is becoming clearer that both are going to require some major reassessments of current assumptions in Washington and Moscow, and other capitals as well. In some ways they may make the world a little safer, but in others more dangerous, at least in the next few years.

Leave aside attempts to make petty propaganda out of dramatic misfortune. They do no credit to either superpower, and aren't likely to have more than transitory impact. The key issues are safety in the use of ***nuclear energy***, and warning in terms of military posture.

There has been a glint of useful new understanding in the Chernobyl cloud along with the radioactive fallout. That is the spreading admission that the atom, even put to peaceful purposes, concerns the whole world and can no longer be considered a matter of purely national policy, cordoned off by haughty claims of sovereign independence.

It was not much noticed that in addition to denouncing the Russians, the seven industrial nations at the Tokyo summit meeting called for a new treaty to establish rules for international behavior in case of ***nuclear*** accident.

About a week later the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, also offered to negotiate. This is an unusual convergence on a sensitive issue, obviously due to the pain of circumstance. The moment must be quickly seized for a conference to write some international ***nuclear*** safety laws, before the pressure to act fades away.

The International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, in Vienna, provides the appropriate forum. It has expertise, but it was established primarily to monitor the ***nuclear*** nonproliferation treaty while helping states without ***nuclear*** weapons to develop ***nuclear energy***. It can recommend safety standards but can't impose them, and countries aren't committed to accepting rules.

It will take a new treaty to give it additional powers. The seven proposed only ''the early elaboration of an international convention committing the parties to report and exchange information in the event of ***nuclear*** emergencies or accidents.'' But the statement also said that ''for each country the maintenance of safety and security is an international responsibility. . . .'' Both obligations should be included in the pact, and the Russians should be quickly invited to fulfill Mr. Gorbachev's promise, necessarily involving inspection. This is an opportunity for cooperation which must not be missed. Many countries, especially but by no means only in the East bloc, have ambitious expansion plans for ***nuclear energy***. They will proceed despite Chernobyl, and safety needs must be watched from the start of construction.

That chance is good news. The bad news is that the U.S. has lost some vital capacity for surveillance and warning of Soviet military moves, which it will have a hard time making up in the near future. This is bound to make the people in charge edgy and more than ever suspicious in the event of crisis. It is also likely to weaken the advocates of arms control, since it adds to doubts about assured verification.

That should also worry the Russians, because it increases the danger of miscalculation or overreaction when the signals are ambiguous. It is a reason to hurry up in the time-marking Geneva negotiations on arms limitation, instead of playing out the current game of each side making bombastic proposals on the assumption that the other side will reject them.

Sadly, there isn't yet much realistic prospect of progress at Geneva. If there were, it would improve the polluted atmosphere during the difficult period just ahead. Warnings of the tensions between Israel and Syria, which could erupt in a new war, give an example of the kind of crisis which could be magnified when Washington and Moscow have extra fears about reading each other's intentions.

Starting right away, moves toward acknowledging obligations in the field of ***nuclear energy*** would at least lighten one area of gloom. It might help set some precedents in the whole issue of inspection. It could make everybody feel a little better after the undeniable demonstrations that national catastrophe on one side affects the other. That would be a modest antidote in the current risky stalemate, but the timing is favorable and some success is badly needed.
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The disastrous accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant north of Kiev has come as a blow to the fast-expanding Soviet ***nuclear energy*** industry. It is due to double its present capacity by the end of the Kremlin's new five-year plan in 1990.

In addition to the frightening human repercussions, diplomats last night were beginning to estimate the possible economic consequences to the state, where ***nuclear energy*** has been heralded as the white hope in the face of stagnating domestic oil production.

Encouraged by the lack of internal anti-***nuclear*** protests and assisted by a sizeable industry specializing in the manufacture of ***nuclear*** reactor components, the Soviet Union has developed one of the most active ***nuclear*** construction programmes in the world, with nearly 30 plants destined for construction in the next decade.

A number of the new plants are under construction near large centres of population, including the Ukrainian town of Kharkov and Odessa on the Black Sea. Only two years ago, the then Minister of Power and Electrification, Mr Petr Neporozhny, said: 'Such stations are very economical and can be built in the immediate vicinity of a city because they do not emit smoke and are totally safe. '

Western experts in Moscow have often expressed concern at the Soviet ***nuclear*** safety record and intelligence analysts believe that the authorities have covered up at least three ***nuclear*** accidents since 1954, when Russia became the first country to use ***nuclear*** power to generate electricity for commercial purposes.

The worst is believed to have occurred in an area just east of the Urals in late 1957 or early 1958, and Western sources believe that the area may still be suffering from the effects of contamination.

Poor attention to safety is attributed to a number of factors including complacency encouraged by the political system, the obsessive secrecy which still surrounds the ***nuclear energy*** programme and pressing demands from the central planners for more speed in construction.

It was not until the early 1980s that any internal debate about the potential hazards began, with a growing number of academics expressing their concern in the official press.

An example of the problems came in 1982 when the chief engineer of the Balakovo plant was quoted by Sovietskaya Rossiya as telling a supplier: 'We examined your pipes with ultrasound - complete junk. There are even defects that can be seen with the naked eye. Moreover, the metal is not of the specification called for in the plant. After all, it is a ***nuclear*** plant. '

Although there are differences over official figures, the most widely accepted show that 39 reactors are now in use inside Russia, most without containment vessels to trap escaping radiation.

This crucial safety device widely used in the West, is understood to have been incorporated in the new plants under construction here.

***Nuclear*** power is now responsible for 11 per cent of the Soviet Union's national electricity output, or 170,000 million kilowatts and is due under the new five-year plan to provide 20 per cent of planned output by 1990.

The dismal performance of the oil production industry - where a number of senior officials have recently been sacked or reprimanded - is seen in the West as the main explanation for the great enthusiasm being shown by Mr Mikhail Gorbachov, the Sovietleader, for large-scale investment in new ***nuclear*** plants.
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Within 24 hours of each other, the United States' two largest ***nuclear*** steam supply system vendors announced reorganizations of their ***nuclear*** service businesses.

On February 26, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, of Pittsburgh, Pa., said it has formed a new ***energy*** systems organizations that brings its ***nuclear*** and non-***nuclear*** power systems activities under one roof. On February 27, General Electric Company's San Jose, Calif.-based ***nuclear energy*** operations unit announced its new ***Nuclear*** Field Services Department.

The two rivals once competed head-to-head for eactor orders in the United States, but no orders have been placed in the United States in seven years now -- the last was for Commonwealth Edison Company's twin Westinghouse pressurized water reactor plant at Carroll County, which has yet to see groundbreaking. Now, both vendors have pushed ahead into the domestic ***nuclear*** services aftermarket, as have the nation's other two major NSSS vendors, Babcock & Wilcox and Combustion Engineering.

Westinghouse's Thomas J. Murrin, president of the ***energy*** and advanced technology group, said that "Merging the fossil and ***nuclear*** technical skills we have developed into a single organization will permit us to more effectively meet the complete spectrum of power plant and service needs." This single entity, he said, will cover plant design, major equipment, complete services, and "broad scope" project management, Named head of the new group is Theodore Stern, executive vice president.

The restructuring at GE involves the merger of the ***nuclear energy*** operations field services forces with the former ***nuclear*** field services components of GE's Domestic Apparatus and Engineering Services Division. With this combination, the company says, all aspects of its commercial ***nuclear*** power field services business are now under a single management. GE says the organization is expected to bring a "higher order of customer service effectiveness" by more closely meshing the company's engineering and technical development organizations with its ***nuclear*** field service and project management skills. George R. Brown was named general manager of the new department.

**Graphic**

Picture 1, Stern; Picture 2, Brown
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Chancellor Helmut Kohl, faced with a strengthened anti-***nuclear*** movement after Chernobyl, yesterday expressed 'deep understanding' for people's anxieties. But, in an address to the Bundestag, he also rejected opposition demands to close West Germany's 19 ***nuclear*** power plants.

Acknowledging that the disaster had caused an immense public shock, Dr Kohl said: 'What we need now is not a German withdrawal from ***nuclear energy***, but the start of international efforts to achieve more ***nuclear*** safety. '

He had earlier told German industrialists in Heidelberg that there was 'no question' of a retreat from ***nuclear*** power, which accounts for 36 per cent of total ***energy*** production.

To jeers and interruptions from Green MPs, Dr Kohl maintained that ***nuclear*** power was kinder to the environment than traditional fuels and warned that any attempts to close plants would harm the economy and cost jobs.

He also defended West Germany's ***nuclear*** power stations as 'the safest in the world,' and said that closure would do nothing to reduce the risk from less secure installations in neighbouring countries.

The Government yesterday dismissed as a 'pure lie' an assertion by the Austrian scientist, Professor Robert Jungk, that safety standards at West German ***nuclear*** plants were rated as 'mediocre' by the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency in Vienna.

Politicians of the ruling conservative-liberal coalition have admitted privately that Chernobyl and the revival of the anti-***nuclear*** debate are likely to pose the most serious threat yet to the Government's general election chances next January.

There has been widespread irritation with what is seen here as Government failure to give timely and adequate warning of the threat from radiation spreading to West Germany.

Opinion polls have shown a surge of support for the antinuclear Green Party to around 9 per cent of the electorate, as well as for the main opposition party, the Social Democrats (SPD). Backing for the wing coalition has dropped below-50 per cent for the first time in three years.

The Social Democrats, largely responsible for the expansion of ***nuclear energy*** in the 1970s have set up a commission to work out a timetable for a phased reduction of ***nuclear energy***.

The SPD's parliamentary leader, Mr Hans-Jochen Vogel, yesterday called for an immediate halt to the construction of a fast-breeder reactor at Kalkar, and of a ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant at Wackersdorf.

The Swedish Prime Minister, Mr Ingvar Carlsson, yesterday promised to study the consequences of closing the Barsebaeck ***nuclear*** power plant 12 miles from the Danish capital.

A bill urging closure of the station, which lies on the coast across the sea from Copenhagen, won a first reading in the Danish Parliament last week.

In Strasbourg, a British EEC Commissioner, Mr Stanley Clinton Davis, yesterday attacked the attitude of ***nuclear*** industry experts to people's fears on safety.

He told the European Parliament he was rejecting two reports prepared by industry and EEC experts on the Sellafield ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant in Britain.

'I do object to a somewhat patronising attitude adopted by experts particularly in this field: 'Do not worry, it is all too complex for ordinary people to understand. Leave it to us. ' I don't think we can leave it entirely to them,' he said.

A United Nations spokesman said yesterday that the Soviet Union had invited UN experts to inspect the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant last year to check that no ***nuclear*** materials were being diverted to military purposes.

Bavarian state authorities put a ban on game hunting yesterday after traces of fallout from Chemobyl were found in venison.
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The liberal Free Democrats, the junior partner in Chancellor Kohl's Government, demanded at a weekend election conference in Hanover a review of plans to build West Germany's first ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant.

Over-ruling the party executive after six hours of heated debate on Saturday, an overwhelming majority of the 400 delegates questioned the recycling concept, and said that the Government should give priority to the permanent storage of ***nuclear*** waste as a cheaper and safer method.

The building site for the reprocessing plant, at Wackersdorf, Bavaria, has become the focus of anti-***nuclear*** protest, and has recently been the scene of violent clashes between police and demonstrators.

Yesterday police again used water-cannon to repel protestors who tried to dig under a fence to enter the building site. They made five arrests.

In other anti-***nuclear*** protests an estimated 20,000 people gathered at the Biblis atomic power station, near Frankfurt, and several thousands blocked a motorway crossing near Saarbrucken, at the border with France, to protest against the Cattenon ***nuclear*** complex on the French side of the Moselle.

The Liberals' decision on Wackersdorf is likely to increase the strain on Dr Kohl's three-party coalition in Bonn, with the conservative Bavarian CSU a driving force behind the pounds 2.5 billion project.

The CSU is likely to be incensed that FDP ministers, who supported the project in the Cabinet, failed to rally the party behind them.

The FDP Wackersdorf motion also means that Dr Kohl's CDU will be isolated in its support for the project in state elections in Lower Saxony in mid-June, in which the CDU is already expected to lose its absolute majority.

Clearly with these elections and its own survival in the Hanover state parliament in mind, the FDP conference - responding to grassroot pressure and public alarm after the Chernobyl accident - also endorsed a call to review plans for West Germany's first fast-breeder reactor at Kalkar, near the Dutch border.

It urged the Bonn Government to enter into negotiations with Belgium and the Netherlands - which have a 15 per cent financing share in the project - to examine whether the Kalkar complex could be scrapped.

The FDP, in a motion supported by the executive, said that Kalkar was not needed for commercial ***energy*** production, and that its use for research was questionable.

But the party rejected an immediate withdrawal from ***nuclear energy*** on ecological and economic grounds, and failed to set a timetable for its abolition. Instead, it called for fresh safety checks on all existing ***nuclear*** plants and ***energy***-saving measures to cut dependence on atomic power in the medium term.

Delegates, and some members of the executive, stressed the need for the party to respond to widespread opposition to ***nuclear*** power.

An opinion poll published yesterday showed that 83 per cent of West Germans are opposed to an expansion of the atomic power programme, and that support for the anti-***nuclear*** Green Party has risen to 10 per cent after the Chernobyl accident.

But the former Economics Minister, Count Otto Lambsdorff, who was granted leave of absence from his trial in Bonn on charges of corruption in connection with the Flick affair, made clear at the conference that influential sections of the FDP leadership remained opposed to reducing ***nuclear energy***.

Anti-***nuclear*** demonstrators marched through Paris on Saturday, and called for a non-***nuclear energy*** policy, the cancellation of plans to build new ***nuclear*** reactors, and the creation of an independent body to oversee ***nuclear*** safety.

With 5,000 participants from the Greens, far-left organisations, and women's and environmental groups, the march was the biggest anti-***nuclear*** demonstration in France for several years.
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The Department of ***Energy***'s fiscal 1987 budget covering federal ***nuclear*** research and development programs, including plans to transfer a large portion of R&D funding to military applications, has been thoroughly aired in a series of public hearings before the House Subcommittee on ***Energy*** Research and Production (Committee on Science and Technology), Rep. Marilyn Lloyd (D., Tenn.), chairman.

These hearings, which were completed during the first week in March, presented arguments by DOE officials, who defended their program selections, by national laboratory speakers, some of whom decried the loss of vital ***nuclear*** R&D programs, by military representatives, who described future military and space needs for ***nuclear*** power reactors, and by members of the private sector, who had a variety of opinions on the future of ***nuclear energy*** and on what the federal government should be doing to advance civilian reactor technology.

James W. Vaughan, Jr., the DOE's acting assistant secretary for ***nuclear energy***, appeared first before the panel to defend the program selections and budget allocations requested by the ***Energy*** Department, but, before he spoke, both Lloyd and Rep. Sid Morrison (R., Wash., and ranking minority member of the subcommittee) expressed considerable concern that the civilian ***nuclear*** programs are being decimated by budgetary restrictions and by transfers of funds to military applications. Vaughan gave a survey paper covering the entire ***nuclear*** fission program, and he explained in some detail the military and space applications for which funds are being requested. He did not, however, present line item budget figures in his paper because these were before the subcommittee in the budget document.

The table presents the ***nuclear energy*** R&D figures that the DOE released to the press.

During the questioning period, in response to a panel member's concern about the apparent militarization of the fission program, Vaughan reminded his questioner that the current civilian industry has its roots in the naval reactor program; thus, he implied, the proposed developments for military and space applications will spin off technological benefits for the private sector.

Lloyd said she is particularly concerned about the future of the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor (HTGR) program, calling it the "flagship" of the subcommittee's vital R&D interests and noting that the DOE proposes to fund this program at only about $5 million in fiscal 1987, down from $32 million in fiscal 1986. Vaughan replied that he sees the near-term commercial future for an HTGR purely in the light of its potential for process heat, but he added that no market forces appear to be burgeoning for this application. Accordingly, he paid his respects to the HTGR, but offered no willingness to transfer money to support further R&D for this technology.

In an overview statement, Vaughan said that the DOE's commitment to ***nuclear energy*** remains firm and that the Administration places a high priority on ensuring that this ***energy*** option continues "to contribute to a strong, stable, and secure ***energy*** base to meet both civilian and military requirements."

The assistant secretary noted, however, that the DOE is also committed to supporting the "bipartisan effort to control and reduce the Federal deficit." Thus, he continued, certain ***nuclear*** R&D programs, which may "appear to some [to be] worthwhile," are being eliminated or significantly reduced. Nonetheless, he said, Department officials believe that each remaining program "is sharply focused to make optimum use of limited resources."

Light-water reactors remain the best hope for the future of ***nuclear energy***, Vaughan said, and he decried the institutional and technical barriers that are now impeding the viability of the LWR option. Unless these problems are rendered benign, there is scant hope for realizing any potential from advanced reactors, he said.

The department will seek to move forward advanced, state-of-the-art, LWR designs and legislation to facilitate ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission certification of them. Beyond the LWR, the advanced reactor program will be focused on key features affecting the economic, passive safety, and technical issues of those designs, Vaughan said.

The decline in ***nuclear*** orders has led to a relaxation of the urgency for advanced reactors for civilian applications, Vaughan continued; thus, the Department has decided to adjust the pace of the civilian reactor development program to meet growing space and defense needs. It will do this at the expense of the civilian programs instead of initiating a buildup of new, separate, and costly programs unique to space and defense applications. With regard to this item, existing DOE facilities at national laboratories, such as the Experimental Breeder Reactor II at Argonne-West in Idaho, and the Fast Flux Test Facility at Hanford, Wash., will serve the needs of the new defense applications, althouggh it has not been made clear exactly how the civilian and defense work will be apportioned among them.

Space ***nuclear*** systems

The bulk of Vaughan's presentation dealt with space/defense ***nuclear*** power systems. While describing each system for which fiscal 1987 funds are requested, the assistant secretary explained that the need for some of these systems, and for others as well, is still evolving. Among the systems he mentioned are the following:

\* *SP-100 space reactor*. The selected concept of this project employs a compact, liquid-metal-cooled, fast-spectrum reactor with out-of-core thermoelectric power conversion. It will be designed, built, and tested at a reference power of 300 kWe, and the DOE has selected Hanford as the preferred site for the ground demonstration testing, to be carried out by fiscal 1991. Flight system production, qualification, and flight demonstration and application are scheduled for fiscal 1991-1993.

\* *Small* ***nuclear*** *power sources*. This program will fill a need for ground-based power systems that can operate continuously in harsh environments with minimum operator attention and with freedom from the need of frequent replenishments. These systems must have high reliability, low maintenance, long lifetimes, and simplified logistics. ***Nuclear*** reactor technology appears to offer a feasible and improved alternative to existing conventional systems for applications in the North Warning System (previously known as DEW line installations) across northern Canada.

The components of this system use state-of-the-art technology. For example, the ***nuclear*** fuel will consist of pellets of the type used in HTGR's, and an organic Rankine cycle will be similar to those used on fossil-fueled generators used for communications on the Alaskan oil pipeline and for waste heat recovery on several industrial processes. The initial objective of this program is to ground test a demonstration reactor by late fiscal 1987.

\* *Multimegawatt terrestrial power source*. The Air Force and the Stragetic Defense Initiative have interests that will culminate in the design for a hardened ***nuclear*** power plant with a nominal rating of 10 MWe. The specifications for this design call for a passively safe reactor, with a capacity factor in excess of 90 percent, refueling intervals ranging from 4-10 years, and the capability of being hardened against specific military threats.

Conceptual design studies for this project have been performed, and the concept is considered to be sound. A request for proposals for the advanced plant design has been prepared, and two concepts will be selected in late fiscal 1986 for detailed design. The preliminary design will be completed by the end of fiscal 1987.

\* *Advanced* ***nuclear*** *systems*. This project will develop, demonstrate, and deliver radioisotope thermelectric generators (RTGs) for military and civilian space and terrestrial missions. ***Nuclear*** power is the only option for planetary exploration in the outer regions of dark space, and a classic example of this was provided recently by Voyager-2 and its pictures of Uranus -- a planet so far from the sun that it receives 97.7 percent less sunlight than Earth. More than eight years after the launch, the RTGs on Voyager-2 are still performing above predicted capabilities.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration plans to continue the use of RTGs on its next generation of planetary explorers. These generators will be built with power levels greater than 300 W, but several can be installed together to provide up to a kilowatt or more of electrical power.

A major effort under the RTG program has been the design, fabrication, and delivery of isotopic power supplies in support of the NASA Galileo and Ulysses missions (see related story, this issue, page 100). Four general-purpose flight RTGs, including one spare, and 110 radioisotope heater units for thermal control of spacecraft components have been delivered fro these missions. Following proposed June 1987 launches, the DOE will support these missions by continued testing on the qualification and engineering units of the RTGs, will analyze performance data, and will provide NASA with periodic long-range predictions for mission planning.

National laboratories

Representatives of several national laboratories followed Vaughan with testimony before the Lloyd panel. The laboratories with programs oriented toward defense applications are in the best shape under the fiscal 1987 budget, and those with advanced reactor test facilities, such as Argonne-West with the EBR-II and Hanford with the FFTF, remain uncertain over how much these test devices will be adapted to defense programs. The representatives from those two laboratories, however, expressed gratitude that their facilities will be able to continue operation during stringent budgetary conditions.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is in Lloyd's home district, will be severely affected by the DOE's fiscal 1987 budget, stated Fred R. Mynatt, the laboratory's associate director. He expressed considerable concern over the consolidated fuel reprocessing program, which is being reduced from about $12.5 million to $1 million to $2 million, and over the combined reactor technology programs, which are to be reduced from $9 million to $6.5 million. Moreover, the laboratory's HTGR program will suffer what appears to be a deadly blow, with only $700 000 specifically identified in the fiscal 1987 budget for this work at Oak Ridge.

According to Mynatt, the net reduction in the ORNL civilian reactor program is about $14 million, which means the loss of approximately 270 staff members. Before 1984, these programs were funded at more than $40 million per year, but now a substantial part of the laboratory's activities is rapidly disappearing, he said.

Mynatt expressed particular dismay over the demise of the consolidated reprocessing program, which has attained worldwide recognition in advanced technologies, including remote operation and maintenance, computer-controlled operation, proliferation-resistant safeguards, and waste reduction. This program is currently in the final stages of a major prototypical hardware development phase, and considerably more than $100 million has been invested in it. Program termination will mean the end of the technology, he said, because the permanent loss of staff will prevent further development.

The testimony of Michael Stevenson, of Los Alamos National Laboratory, was also significant because it concerned technology transfer between military and civilian programs. Los Alamos deals almost exclusively with military applications, and Stevenson described a symbiosis between the technology development for advanced civilian reactors and compact, high-performance military power sources.

The small ***nuclear*** power source reactor (described above) will use the same graphite-based particle fuel concept as in large HTGR designs, Stevenson said. The selected concept for SP-100 uses uranium-nitride, which was first investigated as an advanced fuel for large breeder reactors. It will be fabricated at Los Alamos using production capabilities first developed for advanced carbides in the LMFBR program. The SP-100 nitride fuel is being tested at the EBR-II and the FFTF, which are also heavily involved in civilian reactor development.

The private sector

The final presentations before the Lloyd subcommittee came from representatives of the ***nuclear*** industry and the financial community. Speakers for the Electric Power Research Institute and reactor vendors (Combustion Engineering, General Electric, and Westinghouse) all supported the DOE contention that, in the near term, the best opportunity to restore the ***nuclear*** option is to build upon proven LWR technology. All referred to on-going advanced design work for large LWRs, which remain the big guns for the International market outside the United States.

They spoke also of the potential for mid-sized LWRs, and the EPRI representative explained in some detail the program the Institute has under way to design an advanced LWR for future market penetration. These speakers also agreed that liquid-metal reactors should be considered the next-generation plants (after LWRs). The LMRs will make more economic use of ***nuclear*** fuels, and are a natural bridge to breeders, whcih all these speakers believe will ultimately provide most of the world's electricity. Each of these private-sector speakers also questioned the wisdom of robbing the civilian ***nuclear*** R&D program to pay for military and space applications saying this will mortgage the nation's ***energy*** future.

Some speakers before the Lloyd panel, however, did not agree that the future of ***nuclear*** power hangs on the LWR, and representatives of GA Technologies, GE, and Rockwell International made strong arguments for early demonstrations of advanced reactor concepts, namely, the HTGR, the GE PRISM design, and RI's SAFR design.

The odd couple

Carl Walske, president of the Atomic Industrial Forum, and Mitchell S. Diamond, vice president at Booz-Allen & Hamilton, spoke one after the other and presented arguments about the future of ***nuclear*** power that were in diametric opposition.

Walske spoke first. The centerpiece of his presentation was very similar to the arguments of the reactor vendors; near the end of his paper, however, he made the following observation:

"One consequence [of the existing conditions] is that we should try hard to achieve efficient operation of our largest reactors and to obtain the economies from their large size that are, in principle, available. Others abroad have done better than the U.S. in this regard. For the reason I am reluctant to embrace the current enthusiasm in some quarters for developing smaller size reactors. The cost implications of small reactors should be carefully considered."

Diamond followed with a scholarly presentation on the institutional problems, and predicted that ***nuclear*** plants will *not* be chosen to meet the utility commitments that will be needed on-line in the mid-1990s. There is too much uncertainty surrounding ***nuclear*** power, he said, and the greatest of these (cost uncertainties) can be laid to regulation. Regulatory activities account for more than 70 percent of the average real cost increase, with the result that U.S. plants typically cost 50 percent more than those built in France and Japan.

The basic problem with the ***nuclear*** industry, Diamond said, is that its product does not fit the description of the ideal electric generator of the future, which would:

\* Be available and economic in small sizes (to allow closer matching of facilities with growth and to limit the risk associated with an individual commitment).

\* Have a short lead time from order to in-service date.

\* Have reasonably predictable construction cost and schedule.

\* Be proven and reliable in use.

\* Have no adverse impact on the enviorment or on public attitude.

"This new ***nuclear*** product must meet one additional hurdle," Diamond added. "It will not suffice . . . for the proposed ***nuclear*** plant to be roughly equivalent, or marginally better, than its coal equivalent. In that situation, given the ready availability of coal in the U.S., and the pressure of strongly held views on ***nuclear energy***, the choice would still be too risky, and ***nuclear*** would not win. The new ***nuclear*** product must not only meet the market's basic criteria, but it must be a clearly superior choice over other available alternatives. . . .

"Finally, all parties with any interest in a possible revival of ***nuclear energy*** in the U.S. should recognize the value of a cooling-off period. Accumulating some good, safe operating experience, completing current plants and getting past the current issues of rate increases, imprudency, disallowances and overcapacity will create an enviroment [that] will allow a more useful debate to take place on the proper role of ***nuclear energy*** in the U.S."

FISCAL 1987 ***NUCLEAR ENERGY*** R&D BUDGET

|  | **Budget Authority** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **($ in millions)** |  |
|  | **FY 1986** | **FY 1987** |
|  | **Estimate** | **Request** |
| ***NUCLEAR ENERGY*** |  |  |
| Light-water reactors | $ 48.1 | $ 41.0 |
| Advanced reactor research and development | 128.6 | 49.5 |
| Space and defense power systems | 20.2 | 71.7 |
| Advanced ***nuclear*** systems | 19.5 | 23.6 |
| Facilities | 132.2 | 121.8 |
| Water-cooled breeder reactor technology | 19.0 | 13.8 |
| Program direction | 9.8 | 11.3 |
| TOTAL, ***NUCLEAR ENERGY*** | $ 377.4 | $ 332.7 |

**Graphic**

Picture, Vaughan: DOE's ***nuclear*** commitment firm
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Commercial extraction of uranium from phosphoric acid in Morocco, originally scheduled for start in 1985, has been postponed indefinitely. The project is, however, being kept alive at the research level, poised for a quick start on recovering the officially estimated average of 150 grams U/metric ton of phosphoric acid if and when the official signal is given.

As electricity demand growth lags behind projections and as oil prices fall, the country's first ***nuclear*** power plant is now not expected on the grid until 2000. Under earlier plans, this would have meant a long delay in the uranium-from-phosphate program as well, as it was destined to supply feed for Moroccan reactors. However, Moroccan officials say that the whole philosophy of the domestic U recovery program is being re-examined and that it may be unhooked from the ***nuclear*** power program to take a life of its own.

With startup in February of the new $1-billion Lasfar phosphate chemical complex at El Jadida, Morocco's phosphoric acid production capacity will climb to 2.8-million MT/yr by year's end, almost double present levels. But for the time being, no steps are planned to start recovering uranium from the almost wholly export-oriented phosphate product, according to A. Bouhaouli, director for ***energy*** in the Moroccan Ministry of ***Energy*** and Mines.

The great decline in uranium prices in recent years has blocked the Moroccan U-from-phosphate program. "International prices (for U) are not very encouraging. We are not prepared to lose money on the program. . . . With oil prices going down the way they are now, the future is not bright, because the cost of ***energy*** was the main factor in deciding to recover the uranium," said Larbi El Amari, director of CERPHOS (Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches des Phosphates Mineraux), the R&D arm of the state-owned phosphate company, Office Cherifien des Phosphates (OCP). CERPHOS is responsible for developing the U-extraction technology.

The U-from-phosphate project had been moving forward rapidly before being put on ice, according to Bouhaouli. A full-cycle pilot plant has been set up at CERPHOS laboratories in Casablanca; in addition, the first stage (pre-treatment) of a semi-industrial plant was erected at OCP's Safi chemical complex, where nominal phosphoric acid capacities in the several units total 1.5-million MT/yr of P-205. Basic design of the first in a series of commercial plants at Safi, with an annual production capacity of 210 MT of uranium concentrate, was "well along" when it was halted officially by OCP, he said.

CERPHOS is now focusing its reduced efforts on further study of its own technology and monitoring of international developments (notably in the U.S. and France) involving "new, potentially more efficient techniques." CERPHOS' in-house research is into the DEPA-TOPO process (which uses a mix of di-(2-ethyl hexyl) phosphoric acid and trioctyl phosphenic oxide), while a second track concerns research into "slightly different processes" in collaboration with both French and West German research centers, El Amari said, declining to identify these further.

The original impetus for the U-recovery program came from national ***energy*** plans that identified uranium and shale oil as Morocco's only major domestic ***energy*** resources. Available uranium reserves were estimated officially at 9-million MT, and the 1981-85 ***energy*** program aimed at producing about 16-billion kilowatt-hours from ***nuclear*** power plants in the period 1994-2000. But in the meantime, the ***nuclear*** power program has been stretched out and revised, according to officials at the national electricity board, ONE (Office National de l'Electricite). Electricity demand growth has decelerated over the past five years with the general economic recession and is currently projected to continue at an average annual rate of 7% rather than the 9% projected earlier. A feasibility study on inauguration of a Moroccan ***nuclear energy*** program in the 1990s, being conducted for ONE by France's Sofratome, is expected to be completed next year.

Moroccan officials do not now expect the country's first ***nuclear*** plant (in the 600- to 900-MW range) to come on line before 2000. In the event an "all-***nuclear***" scenario were adopted to meet projected power demand, three further reactors would be started in construction by 2000. However, officials say, for "financial reasons" consideration is now also being given to a mixed scenario combining ***nuclear*** and imported coal.

In the meantime, ONE is studying different ***nuclear*** fuel supply strategies, all based on use of domestic natural uranium but differing in the extent of domestic fuel cycle development. One of the options involves export sale of domestic uranium concentrate and purchase abroad of fabricated fuel, either with or without a link between the two transactions, the officials said.

Bouhaouli, of the Ministry of ***Energy*** & Mines, noted that the international market had demonstrated in the past few years that "***nuclear energy*** and uranium development are not connected now. The economic conditions for the two are different, and maybe (even) at odds with each other. At best, the interrelationship is a complex one." In Morocco, Bouhaouli indicated, the two will be treated separately: "Our uranium extraction program is not interconnected with the ***nuclear energy*** program . . . because, at this point, we don't know which technologies will be used, or when." All the same, he remarked, "the availability of domestic uranium is an extra plus for the ***nuclear energy*** program."

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)

**End of Document**



[***The Soviet Nuclear Disaster;***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3S51-M1G0-001B-M001-00000-00&context=1516831)[***Eastern Europe Seeks To Calm Growing Public Fears***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3S51-M1G0-001B-M001-00000-00&context=1516831)

Financial Times (London,England)

May 1, 1986, Thursday

London

Copyright 1986 The Financial Times Limited

**Section:** SECTION I; Pg. 2

**Length:** 379 words

**Byline:** Leslie Colitt, Berlin

**Body**

East European governments yesterday moved to calm growing domestic fears over the implications of the Chernobyl disaster.

The East German authorities said their Soviet-built reactors operated under East Germany's "own national safety regulations" which were strictly observed.

This statement was prominently displayed yesterday on the front page of the Communist newspaper Neues Deutschland. It said there was no need to re-examine the East German reactors as they were "completely different" from those at Chernobyl. The official news agency added that local radioactivity levels presented no health hazard.

Government media in Czechoslovakia and Hungary took the same line.

East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria all use the Soviet-designed VVER pressurised water reactors, which are also built under licence by Czechoslovakia's Skoda engineering company. A spokesman for Skodaexport in Prague said in a telephone interview they were "completely safe."

However, last autumn Mr Oldrich Vales, head of the company's ***nuclear energy*** division, acknowledged that a "principal change" had been made in the ***nuclear*** power plants built for use in Eastern Europe to "increase their safety."

Reactors produced by Skoda, he said, now contained several "advanced processes" to increase both their "efficiency and safety." Mr Vales explained that the latest ***nuclear*** power station to be built in Czechoslovakia at Temelin in southern Bohemia - near the Austrian border - is to have a Westinghouse type containment vessel similar to that which Finland built around the Soviet reactors it installed several years ago.

Until now, Eastern Europe's planners have insisted there was no alternative to the high priority expansion programme for ***nuclear*** power. Limited supplies of Soviet oil as well as the difficulty and environmental problems of expanding coal output were cited as the main reasons.

Comecon, whose ***nuclear*** power stations had an installed capacity of 30,000 Mw at the end of 1984, plans to increase this to 100,000 Mw by 1990. Yet the head of the Comecon secretariat's Department of ***Nuclear Energy***, Mr Alexander Panasenko, said late last year that the organisation's ***nuclear*** programme had to be scaled down because of "technical difficulties."
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How refreshing it was to see the three party leaders in the Ontario

Legislature comment in statesmanlike manner yesterday to the ***nuclear***

disaster in the Soviet Union.

Premier David Peterson reported to the House on the extent of the

disaster, as best as could be ascertained at the time. Conservative leader

Larry Grossman responded by suggesting that Ontario, with its extensive

interests in ***nuclear*** power, offer any technical assistance it could. NDP

leader Bob Rae went a little further, asking whether this disaster would

prompt a review of Ontario's growing dependence on ***nuclear energy***.

Not too long ago, this non-partisan exchange of views might not have

occurred. Former premier Bill Davis, for one, could rarely resist the

opportunity to smear the NDP as somehow sharing the philosophy of the

bosses of the Soviet Union. Former premier Frank Miller also used this

tactic occasionally when he wanted to inflame the NDP.

Example of tactics

On one occasion, for instance, Mr. Rae question the wisdom of permitting

cruise-missile testing. Mr. Davis responded with, "I have to understand

that the points of view the member (Mr. Rae) expressed are not being

expressed by the Soviet Union. The member may have some influence on them.

I do not."

Questions of ***nuclear*** disarmament didn't touch him either; he claimed

they were a federal matter outside the purview of the provincial drainage

ditch.

The smears must have left some stains behind, even in Mr. Davis's

retirement. Mr. Rae felt compelled to preface his remarks yesterday with

the comment, "Whatever we think of the Soviet system . . ." Mr. Grossman,

who had suggested sending help moments earlier, had not bothered to

qualify his remarks and yet it is extremely doubtful that he has close

friends in the Kremlin.

Mr. Davis had a sense of occasion and compassion, and I don't mean to

suggest that he would have made light of this disaster. I wonder, though,

whether he might have chosen to ignore it, as he did ***nuclear*** disarmament

and cruise missiles, as being outside provincial jurisdiction.

***Nuclear energy*** is hardly outside provincial jurisdiction, of course,

especially since Ontario is becoming increasingly dependent on it. This is

the point Mr. Rae was pursuing, although he seemed to realize belatedly

that he may have gone a little too far.

Chance for points

While he was reflecting on Ontario Hydro's policy of cooking all its eggs

in one reactor, he may have heard an opportunistic tone creep into his own

voice. Nobody in the Western world knew how many hundreds or thousands of

people might have died near Kiev, but here was a provincial party leader

appearing to seek political points.

"It's important not to overreact," he said, "but to say nothing and to

do nothing would be fundamentally wrong. We've all got an obligation to

recognize there are limits to scientific knowledge."

He conceded that Canadian scientists swear by the Candu system as being

safe, "just as I'm sure Soviet scientists were telling Soviet authorities

their system was foolproof as well."

Is that alarmist stuff? Well, it won't make people living near a

***nuclear*** generating plant feel any safer. It is also a step removed from

Mr. Rae's initial concern, which centred on too much reliance on one

source of power.

In that, Mr. Rae has good company in Vince Kerrio, the province's

minister of ***energy***. He said the Government would re-examine its policy of

heavy reliance - about 70 per cent within a decade - on ***nuclear energy***.

But all in all, the enlightened exchange of views swept away some of

the dusty cobwebs of provincialism. It took place on the first day of new

rules in the Legislature. May we have many more new attitudes as well.
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The Soviet Union celebrated May Day with parades and pageantry Thursday and publicly ignored the ***nuclear*** disaster in the Ukraine that spread radiation over large areas of the country.

But in the Red Square parade in the Soviet capital, there were no posters saluting the ***nuclear energy*** industry. It appeared that all references to ***nuclear*** power were removed from the two-hour parade that features thousands of marchers carrying banners and posters.

A Soviet press report on the May Day parade in Kiev, only 80 miles from the accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant, said the Ukranian capital staged a colorful ceremoney. There was no mention of the ***nuclear*** accident.

The Moscow parade had about a dozen posters carried by workers that criticized the United States for attacks on Libya and for not agreeing with a Soviet proposal to halt ***nuclear*** tests.

Soviet leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev and other members of the Communist Party Politburo viewed the parade from atop the Lenin mausoleum, occasionally waving at the passing men, women and children passing through Red Square. Gorbachev's family stood on a viewing stand with other invited spectators.

In past May Day parades, the placards and floats celebrating Soviet labor achievements have included specific references to ***energy*** workers, including ***nuclear*** power workers.

The party's Central Committee every year publishes a list of about 100 official slogans weeks in advance of May Day. The list this year was published on April 13, before the Chernobyl accident, and included calls to meet ***energy*** plans.

In Thursday's parade, there were two posters promoting ***energy*** conservation, but there were no specific references to ***nuclear energy***.

Parades were held in other cities across the country in what is one of the major holidays in the Soviet Union.

The parade was held under sunny skies and kicked off a four-day holiday weekend.

Gorbachev's wife, Raisa, spoke briefly with several Western reporters allowed to approach where she stood with her daughter and granddaughter. "It's a wonderful holiday," she told the reporters.

Mrs. Gorbachev was not asked about the Chernobyl accident.

About a dozen placards were aimed at the United States. One depicted President Reagan, atop the White House, beating a drum with the slogan, "We are fighting terrorism" while American rockets were hitting Libya.

Another poster said, "Shame on American imperialism." It showed an Uncle Sam with its pockets bulging with missiles and standing on Libya.
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It rained Friday in Hiroshima and many residents of the first city devastated by an atomic bomb stayed inside or huddled under umbrellas, fearing the rain bore contamination from the Soviet ***nuclear*** plant disaster.

But officials of the Science and Technology Agency in Tokyo said no abnormal levels of radiation were detected in rains around the country.

An official of the Radiation Effects Research Foundation, which studies the victims of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of World War II, volunteered the agency's services to help the Soviet Union assess damage and treat victims from the accident at its Chernobyl plant.

Japan is especially interested in the catastrophe because ***nuclear*** bombs killed an estimated 140,000 people in Hiroshima and as many as 70,000 in Nagasaki in August 1945.

"Some people are reacting in a simple-minded way, shielding themselves under umbrellas, being careful not to get wet from the rain today," said Katsukuni Tanaka, a reporter at Hiroshima Home Television Co.

A spokesman for the Hiroshima city government, Jun Hasegawa, quoted Mayor Takeshi Araki as saying, "Based on Hiroshima's experience, we must spread the word on the dangers of atomic use.

"***Nuclear energy*** production must be amid cautious safety measures. Even in the case of such peaceful use of ***nuclear energy***, damage from an accident is not limited to just one country, but spreads," the mayor was quoted as saying.

The Chernobyl accident "proves once again the dangers of ***nuclear*** power plants we have been warning about," said Hiraku Inoue of the Japan Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, which is affiliated with the Socialist Party.

Japan has 32 ***nuclear*** power reactors and is among the world's leaders in producing electricity by ***nuclear*** means.

Itsuzo Shigematsu, chairman of the Radiation Effects Research Organization, said, "We would be happy to provide any information we can. The first thing that needs to be done is to assess to what extent and how much radiation has spread.

"It's not an easy process," he added. "We're still researching that in Hiroshima and Nagasaki."

The foundation is supported jointly by the United States and Japan and was formed in 1975 from the U.S.-run Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission.
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THE HAGUE - Dutch voters are expected to throw out their centre-right government in a general election tomorrow in large measure because the Soviet ***nuclear*** accident turned them against The Hague's ambitious ***nuclear energy*** plans.

Tipped to gain seats in the election and extra leverage for the inevitable post-election coalition haggling is an opposition Labor party committed to barring U.S. cruise missiles and scrapping the country's ***nuclear*** power industry.

This prospect, predicted in all the opinion polls, represents a sudden turnaround in the fortunes of the popular prime minister, Ruud Lubbers, 47.

Painful retreat

Six weeks ago he seemed on course for a narrow victory despite his backing for hotly contested North Atlantic Treaty Organization plans to site 48 ***nuclear*** cruise missiles in the Netherlands, and a high jobless rate of 15 per cent.

His prospects slumped when radioactive fallout from the Chernobyl reactor in Soviet Ukraine drifted over the Netherlands and forced him into a painful retreat on his plans for a fivefold expansion of the Dutch ***nuclear*** power industry.

Latest polls indicate the four-year-old coalition of his Christian Democrats and the right-wing Liberals will fall three or four seats short of a majority in the 150-seat parliament in tomorrow's election.

Labor, led by former prime minister Joop den Uyl, 66, is expected to jump nine seats to 56.

The remaining 20-odd seats are likely to be shared by small left-wing groups, including Communists, small right-wing and religious groups and D'66, a centre-left party which may end up holding the key to the next coalition.

NATO allies

If Labor emerges as the biggest party, it will expect to be the first to try to form a government, a prospect certain to dismay Atlantic alliance allies still recovering from the drama of last year's long-delayed Dutch decision to accept cruise missiles.

Labor insists it will not allow the 48 missiles to be deployed when the delivery date comes around in 1988, although parliament has ratified a Dutch-U.S. treaty on the plan.

Cancellation of cruise here would shatter NATO unity in its approach to East-West arms talks. Perhaps happily for the allies, it looks as though Labor will find little support for the move among its possible coalition partners.

Only the small left parties back the no-cruise stand and they are not expected to win enough seats to carry the issue.

Centre-left D'66, which is tipped for 10 seats, has swung against cancellation of the cruise.

Unemployment high

Lubbers' Christian Democrats, the centrist bloc which has taken part in every government since World War II, remain committed to cruise deployment, as do the Liberals.

The missiles will be only one of many bones of contention. Polls show voters more worried about unemployment, at 15 per cent one of the highest rates in the industrialized world.

The issue which split them most clearly in the latter weeks of the campaign was ***nuclear energy***, as radioactive fallout from the Chernobyl accident triggered strong public concern and trapped the government in an uncomfortable corner.

Plans for building up to four ***nuclear*** power stations during the 1990s to increase the ***nuclear*** share of electricity supply from 6 to 33 per cent, were nearing its final hurdle when the radiation alert sounded. But now Lubbers has been forced to shelve them.

Controversy over the ***nuclear*** program was highlighted yesterday when explosives experts were called in to destroy a small homemade bomb found at a ***nuclear energy*** research organization in The Hague.

Police found the package, including wires and a clock, at the offices of Neratoom NV after a group calling itself "the Red Revolutionary Front" telephoned a warning to a news agency.
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Radiation \_ Sweden says worst is over UN ***nuclear*** experts to go to USSR LONDON (AAP): The United Nations ***nuclear energy*** agency said today that its chief and two ***nuclear*** experts would go to Moscow at the Kremlin's invitation in connection with the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station.

The Vienna-based International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency (IAEA), the UN body which promotes the peaceful uses of ***nuclear energy***, said director Hans Blix and two senior experts would leave for Moscow tomorrow.

It did not say whether any of them would visit the area around the Chernobyl plant, north-west of Kiev.

QNP

Last week the agency offered to put the Soviet Union in touch with experts in the West and to make available its own experts to help fight the fire and radiation leak at Chernobyl.

Several of the European countries that detected a rise in radiation after the accident on April 26 said today that levels had improved.

Sweden, whose discovery of fallout last week was the West's first clue that there had been a radiation leak in the Soviet Union, proclaimed the worst to be over.

At the Tokyo economic summit, President Reagan expressed support for a West German-sponsored call for the participants to issue a demand for tighter international regulations on ***nuclear*** power.

Mildly radioactive rain fell on Japan today and the Science and Technology Agency there cautioned against drinking unfiltered rain water but said the radioactivity was far below tolerance levels.

Moscow responded to international criticism of its handling of the disaster with a fierce attack on its critics but little new information.

The Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda said Western commentators were trying to use the affair to divert attention from US actions, such as the April 15 bombing raids on Libya.

Last night Moscow Communist Party chief, Boris Yeltsin, said 49,000 people had been evacuated from the area around the Chernobyl plant.

The Polish news agency PAP said that between Monday and Friday milk contamination had exceeded admissible radiation levels for children by 72 per cent, but air contamination was no higher than 20 per cent of the IAEA's emergency level.

Soviet television last night showed the first film of the stricken ***nuclear*** plant at Chernobyl and said the damage there was not as great as reported in the West.
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Atomic power emerged as a major theme at the opening in Hanover yesterday of an election conference of the traditionally ***pronuclear*** Free Democratic Party (FDP), despite strenuous efforts by the Liberal leadership to calm the anti-***nuclear*** mood.

'We are not crazy about ***nuclear*** power .. but we feel we will not be able to do without it in the foreseeable future,' the Liberal leader and economics minister, Mr Martin Bangemann, told delegates. He had earlier expressed 'understanding' for public anxiety about the risks of ***nuclear energy*** after the Chernobyl accident and called for a review of safety standards at West German plants.

Some delegates, including members of the national executive, went further, demanding that the party 'set a sign' for a withdrawal from ***nuclear*** power.

Mrs Hildegard HammBruecher, on the party's leftwing, said: 'We have quite a few people at the top of our party who strongly favour ***nuclear*** power. But the voter is in an anti-***nuclear*** mood. so we'll have to meet half way. '

The SDP's youth wing accused the party leadership of wanting to 'throtle' the ***nuclear*** debate by focusing official attention on the successes of economic policy. They demanded that the party should rethink its stance on ***nuclear*** policy.

But it became clear yesterday that the party leadership, fearing the alienation of traditionally pro-business voters, would soft-pedal on the ***nuclear*** issue and brush aside rank-and-file reservations during the three-day conference.

The FDP, the junior coalition partner in the Bonn Government, is facing defeat in a crucial state poll in Lower Saxony next month, seen as an important indicator for the general election next January.

Noting that the Christian Democrats were likely to lose their absolute majority in the Lower Saxony elections, Mr Bangemann urged voters to back the Free Democrats 'to prevent a red-green alliance of Social Democrats and Greens in the state parliament in Hanover. '

Seeking to rally the broadest possible support for his small party, he stressed its 'tolerant' character and its liberal policies. It was, he said, the 'subsidy-stripping, tax-cutting party. '

The FDP leader attacked the Green Party, which could hold the balance of power in Hanover if the Liberals fail to reenter parliament. The Greens, he said, were using environmental policy and ***nuclear energy*** as a pretext for much more radical goals.
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MISFORTUNE HAS BEFALLEN US: GORBACHEV ***Nuclear*** power "sinister' MOSCOW (AAP): The Chernobyl disaster had shown the ""sinister force" of ***nuclear energy*** out of control for the first time, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said today.

President Chernobyl also announced Moscow would extend its ***nuclear*** test freeze until August 6.

In an address on State television, Mr Gorbachev said: ""A misfortune has befallen us \_ the accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant.

QNP

""For the first time ever we encountered in reality such a sinister force as ***nuclear energy*** that has escaped control . . ."

He said seven people had died from radiation and 299 were still in hospital.

""It is early yet to pass final judgment on the causes of the accident," Gorbachev said.Abyss He said the Chernobyl disaster ""showed again what an abyss will open if ***nuclear*** war befalls mankind.

""In conditions when the attention to ***nuclear*** matters increased, the Soviet Government has decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on ***nuclear*** tests till August 6 this year," he said.

Moscow froze ***nuclear*** testing last August but suspended the halt two months ago after the United States ignored its call to join in a ban.

Making his first public comment on the April 26 disaster, Mr Gorbachev also renewed a call to President Reagan to meet him in Europe to discuss a test ban.

As an alternative venue Mr Gorbachev suggested Hiroshima, the Japanese city where the first atomic bomb was dropped on August 6, 1945, near the end of World War II.Safety He denied the Soviet Union had been late in telling the world of the disaster, reported 48 hours after it took place, and proposed a new mechanism for exchanging information on ***nuclear*** accidents.

He also suggested ""creating an international regime of safe development of ***nuclear*** power on the basis of close co-operation of all nations dealing with ***nuclear*** power engineering".

""A system of prompt warning and supply of information in the event of accidents and faults at ***nuclear*** power stations should be established in the framework of this regime," he said.Mountain of lies He attacked the United States and the Western media for launching an ""unrestrained anti-Soviet campaign" over the accident.

""Generally speaking, we faced a veritable mountain of lies \_ most malicious lies," he said.

The United States and ""their most zealous allies" including West Germany ""regarded the mishap only as another possibility to put up additional obstacles holding back the development of the current East-West dialogue", he said.
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VIENNA - The International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency in Vienna received a short official message from the Soviet government yesterday informing it of the disaster at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant, but offering no details.

Although the Soviets have asked for help from the Swedish and West German governments, no such request has been made to the IAEA.

The organization was founded in 1957 in order to pool information from all countries interested in the peaceful development of ***nuclear energy*** in order to advise and help individual states when necessary.

But despite its name, the agency is unable to exercise any power over its members and does not monitor individual ***nuclear*** power programs.

It has produced extensive safety guidelines for almost every type of reactor, but no member state is bound by them.

Limited inspection

Nonetheless, it has concluded important safeguard agreements with the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union which allow for limited inspection of ***nuclear*** plants in these countries.

These agreements have nothing to do with the safety regulations of power stations, but exist to safeguard and where possible restrict the use of ***nuclear*** fuel for military use.

The IAEA's agreement with the Soviet Union came into force last year and it accepted a Soviet offer to inspect five of its stations.

There are 51 reactors in operation on Soviet territory with a total capacity of 27,756 megawatts. Twenty-eight of these are the type of reactor at Chernobyl: light, water-cooled graphite moderators (RBMKs), which account for well over half of the country's ***nuclear energy*** production.

Yet the IAEA has not been invited to inspect any of these plants and as RBMKs are unique to the Soviet Union, the West is relatively uninformed about how they operate.

One question raised by the accident at Chernobyl is what function the agency is attempting to fulfil.

The Americans and the British are equally selective in the sites they allow the IAEA to inspect. The most important ***nuclear*** station in Britain is Sellafield (formerly Windscale), where access is strictly limited a comparatively unimportant area of the complex.

Significant source

The IAEA is a significant source of information for Third World countries that are developing their own ***nuclear*** programs.

And the agency insists that any help it gives must not be exploited for military purposes.

But if it is regarded as toothless by powers that possess a military ***nuclear*** capability, as the reaction to Chernobyl would suggest, then there must be a question mark over its ability to control the use of its information elsewhere in the world.

\* Misha Glenny is a Star correspondent based in Vienna.
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Ontario Hydro - considered a world leader in ***nuclear energy*** - has some serious safety questions to answer in the wake of the Soviet ***nuclear*** catastrophe at Chernobyl, Premier David Peterson says.

And ***Energy*** Minister Vince Kerrio says the province will offer all its ***nuclear*** experts to help immediately in the disaster's aftermath.

"Anything that we can do to be helpful will certainly be offered," Kerrio said.

Peterson voiced grave concerns about ***nuclear*** power in a statement when he appeared in the Legislature yesterday, then told reporters later the Soviet tragedy raises questions about both Hydro and Atomic ***Energy*** Canada Limited, which has developed the Candu reactors used by Hydro.

Needs explaining

"I think they will have a lot of explaining to do," Peterson said. "The AECL has already got problems and there are a lot of people who disagree with ***nuclear energy*** at the present time."

While Hydro's Bruce and Pickering reactors have consistently rated in the world's top 10 in performance with 80 to 90 per cent efficiency records, the Candu design has been thrown into question by an accident two years ago at Pickering, which caused a three-year shutdown of two reactors.

And the AECL, which sells Candu reactors abroad, has faced slumping sales and layoffs as foreign countries are hesitant to risk purchasing the power plants.

Ontario is one of the largest users of ***nuclear*** power in the world, with two giant eight-reactor stations running at Pickering and Bruce, and a third $11 billion four-reactor station under construction at Darlington, outside Oshawa.

The future of Darlington was already in jeopardy before the Soviet accident, but Peterson said it will now face even tougher opposition.

Such a reaction is natural, Peterson said, for a province such as Ontario which relies so heavily on ***nuclear*** power. Ontario receives 40 per cent of its power from ***nuclear*** reactors, but Darlington's completion in the 1990s would bring that fraction to about 70 per cent.

Peterson said he favors a more "reasonable balance" in ***energy*** production methods, but said decisions on Darlington must wait until all the facts of the Soviet disaster are known.

"This thing has to be thought through and analyzed in great detail," he said.

Re-evaluate program

New Democratic Party leader Bob Rae, in a statement in the Legislature, called for the government to immediately move to stop Darlington and re-evaluate Hydro's ***nuclear*** program.

He said the province entered into ***nuclear*** affairs with "eternal optimism" but now must realize "there are limits to man's knowledge, limits to our expertise."

Progressive Conservative leader Larry Grossman agreed it is time to review the future of Ontario's ***nuclear*** program.
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The alliance of his Christian Democrats with right-wing Liberals,

expected less than a week ago to lose office, won a 12-seat majority in

the 150-seat parliament and appeared firmly on course for a new four-year-

term.

The Labor opposition, which is against ***nuclear energy*** and cruise

missiles, won 52 seats, the final result showed.

Mr. Lubbers' Christian Democrats won 54 seats and their Liberal

partners 27 seats, for a total of 81.

Friend and foe alike greeted the victory as a triumph for Mr. Lubbers,

47, whose personal popularity was credited with influencing the campaign

after the April 26 accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** reactor near Kiev in

Ukraine forced him into a damaging pullback from ***nuclear energy*** plans.

He acknowledged the turnaround in a victory statement to party

loyalists: ''I can now confidently say that instead of measuring the

extent of our retreat, we can now start to judge the extent of our

advances.'

Liberal leader Ed Nijpels, whose party lost seats, predicted firmly

that the two groups would agree on terms to renew their partnership within

five weeks - rapid by Dutch standards.

The result appeared to defy political gravity after a four-year

administration which saw high unemployment, tough spending cuts, bitter

controversy over deployment of U.S. ***nuclear*** cruise missiles and the final

blow of Chernobyl.

Two weeks ago, the Government was shaken when public alarm at the

Chernobyl accident forced it to postpone ambitious plans to expand the

atomic power industry.

With the governing partners set to renew their alliance and leave Labor

in opposition, the painful issue of cruise missiles appeared to be dead in

the Netherlands.

The Government and parliament have approved deployment of 48 of the

missiles in 1988, and public passion on the question, at fever pitch only

six months ago, has all but disappeared.

Labor leader Joop den Uyl, noting his party's gains, expressed a hope

that his party could enter government with the Christian Democrats but

political commentators saw that as nearly impossible, given personal and

policy differences.

Mr. Lubbers, from a rich business family in Rotterdam, has promised to

plow on with the tough austerity policies he used to cut the public

spending deficit.

But with the economy perking up, economists expect a slow fall in

unemployment from its present rate of about 15 per cent - one of the

highest in the industrialized world.
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THE HAGUE (Reuter) - Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers last night led his centre-right coalition to a dramatic general election victory, confounding the opinion polls and brushing aside the threat of a so-called Chernobyl factor.

The alliance of his Christian Democrats with right-wing Liberals won a 12-seat majority in the 150-seat parliament and appeared firmly on course for a new four-year-term.

The Labor opposition, opposed to ***nuclear energy*** and cruise missiles, won 52 seats, the final result showed.

Lubbers' Christian Democrats won 54 seats and the Liberals 27, for a total of 81.

Friend and foe alike greeted the victory as a triumph for the 47-year-old Lubbers, whose personal popularity was credited with swaying the campaign after the Chernobyl accident in the Soviet Union forced him into a damaging pullback from ***nuclear energy*** plans.

New partnership

In a victory statement to party loyalists, he said, "I can now confidently say that instead of measuring the extent of our retreat, we can now start to judge the extent of our advances."

Liberal leader Ed Nijpels, whose party lost seats, predicted firmly that the two groups would agree terms to renew their partnership within five weeks - rapid by Dutch standards.

The result appeared to defy political gravity after four years of coalition government which saw high unemployment, tough spending cuts, bitter controversy over deployment of U.S. ***nuclear*** cruise missiles, and the final blow of Chernobyl.

The government was shaken when public alarm at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** accident forced it to postpone ambitious plans to expand the atomic power industry.

With the ruling partners set to renew their alliance and leave Labor in opposition, the painful issue of cruise missiles appeared to be dead in the Netherlands.

Tough policies

The government and parliament have approved deployment of 48 of the missiles in 1988. Public passion on the question, at fever pitch only six months ago, has virtually disappeared.

Lubbers has promised to plough on with the tough austerity policies he used to cut the public spending deficit.

But with the economy perking up, economists expect a slow fall in unemployment from its present rate of about 15 per cent, one of the highest in the industrialized world.

Labor leader Joop den Uyl, noting his party's gains, expressed a hope it could enter government with the Christian Democrats. But political commentators saw that as near-impossible given personal and policy differences.
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Poland and the Soviet Union have recognised the need to standardise Comecon's radioactive pollution safety norms and to establish automatic notification procedures in case of accidents, according to Mr Jerzy Urban, the government spokesman, writes Christopher Bobinski in Warsaw.

The move follows the evident failure by the Soviet Union to notify Poland of the accident at Chernobyl last week, leaving the Poles with 24 hours of above normal radiation levels and little clear idea of the source.

According to a Soviet communique, a Soviet team of ***nuclear*** experts which has been having talks in Polance also agreed that Polish safety steps like giving children iodine doses had been "correct" at the same time.

Mr Urban yesterday denied that the radioactive pollution had caused any significant economic losses and thus dismissed the idea of seeking compensation from the Soviet Union. He added that foreign bans on imports of Polish food if imposed, would probably be short-lived as iodine radiation levels fell to normal.

Amsterdam: The Dutch Parliament will hold an emergency debate today on the Chernobyl disaster and its implications for the Netherlands' plans to build two ***nuclear*** power stations, writes Laura Raun. It is likely to result in the plans being postponed until after the general election on May 21.

***Nuclear energy*** supplies only 5 per cent of all electricity in the Netherlands compared with 65 per cent in France and 30 per cent in West Germany and the two planned reactors would increase that fivefold.

Mr Ruud Lubbers, the Prime Minister, last week strongly defended his government's ***nuclear*** programme and argued that the Chernobyl accident was no reason to halt plans for more plants.

Rome: Two Italian left-wing parties met yesterday to co-ordinate their strategy for promoting a referendum on the future of ***nuclear*** power in Italy, writes James Buxton. Radical and Proletarian Democracy parties seem determined to capitalise on current popular anxieties about ***nuclear energy***. These are being highlighted in Italy by an official 15-day ban on the sale of certain fresh vegetables and on giving fresh milk to children under 10 and to pregnant women.

Despite depending on imports for the vast majority of its ***energy*** needs, Italy has only three functioning ***nuclear*** power plants. A fourth is under construction ad three more are planned, of which only one is close to going ahead.

Copenhagen: The Danish Agriculture Ministry has placed an immediate ban on putting cows out to grass after increased radiation was measured in grass samples in Jutland, writes Hilary Barnes. The ban will be maintained until levels return to normal.
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The ***nuclear*** accident in the Soviet Union is emerging as a tragedy for the Ukraine and for the ideal of the safe and peaceful use of ***nuclear energy*** around the world.

The failure in March 1979 of the reactor at Three Mile Island in the US led to a moratorium on ***nuclear*** power plant construction in the US and heightened inhibitions towards ***nuclear energy*** everywhere. Yet even after Three Mile Island it remained possible to insist that no-one had been hurt by problems in an atomic power station and that the safety systems had just held.

The disaster at Chernobyl has broken new and fearsome ground. People have been killed. An uncontrollable fire is raging at the power plant. ***Nuclear*** fuel has boiled into the atmosphere. Radioactivity has been wafted thousands of miles into neighbouring countries. The dreaded melt-down of the fuel-core, which fail-safe systems are meant to make impossible, has apparently occurred.

There was a lack of candidness in the early stages of the emergency at Three Mile Island and this secrecy, even if due mainly to disorganisation and uncertainty, did the US ***nuclear*** industry's image no good at all. Yet it was nothing compared with the official obfuscation that has surrounded the events in the Ukraine. It took the atmospheric sensors of the Scandinavian countries to blow the whistle, and even then Moscow did not come clean.

As the fire in the reactor has taken hold, the Soviet Union has been driven towards an openness born of desperation. Sweden and West Germany have been asked if they know how to fight such a thing. But this call for camaraderie and co-operation comes far too late. Anyone with doubts about ***nuclear*** power has noted that a government guaranteeing ***nuclear*** safety has first tried to dissemble and then had to admit its impotence. The Soviet Union this time. Who next?

The Soviet Union is of course a special case when it comes to lack of honesty and this was a special reactor, part of the function of which was to produce plutonium for military uses. But this makes the disaster only a more extreme example of a general truth. The safety governed by national rules and engineering customs, yet the consequences of faulty design or maintenance are not confined by national frontiers. Fall-out crosses them - luckily the wind last weekend was not blowing straight from Kiev into East and West Germany. The fall-out of fear also undermines a source of power that now provides one third of the EEC's electricity.

The International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency is dedicated to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic ***energy*** to peace, health and prosperity." Yet the main thrust of its activities is to prevent the proliferation of ***nuclear*** weapons rather than to raise the safety standards of ***nuclear*** plants around the world.

Nice though it might sound, there is no question of the IAEA's 112 members empowering the agency to become a global ***nuclear*** safety inspectorate. Even if the industrialised nations could reconcile their very different approaches to reactor design, it would be a military-civilian hybrid such as Chernobyl that remained off-limits to the agency and made a nonsense of such a systemic answer to the threat.

Yet just as this disaster promises to demolish old frontiers of secrecy and ideology by demanding an international hunt for a solution, so it should greatly reinforce the readiness of the ***nuclear***-power nations - and the USSR in particular - to be open with each other on civilian ***nuclear*** matters and to use the IAEA as a clearing house for approaches to ***nuclear*** safety.

Chernobyl is moreover a dramatic test of Mr Gorbachev's good intentions. Will the traditional Soviet aloofness and knee-jerk secrecy prevail, both with out and within Russia? Or will there be a new openness, reflecting the way ***nuclear energy*** has become vital for the western regions of the Soviet Union, just as it is for western Europe, and the great importance of sustaining public confidence in it?

So far, this test has not got off to an encouraging start. The Chernobyl accident appears to have made a reality of the "worst case senarios" that nations must accept if they opt for the many advantages of ***nuclear*** power. It is going to require a rapid mastery of the crisis at Chernobyl and very open discussion of its special causes and implications for ***nuclear*** power to remain politically acceptable in much of the western world.
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Sir, - Debates about ***energy*** would be less stimulating if Professor Peter Odell March 25 and April 9 were not around.Unfortunately much of the stimulation arises from exaggeration. Is he really saying that for the next several decades the CEGB will be able to buy coal and heavy fuel oil in 100 million ton pa quantities at prices only one third of those ruling in 1981? One factor he may have overlooked is that internationally traded fuels are usually quoted in dollars: the pound stood at Dollars 2.44 in 1981 as against about Dollars 1.45 today.

The fall in oil prices was due to the collapse of the OPEC cartel which was itself due to the impact on OPEC's highly geared position of a world recession (at least partly due to the ***energy*** price increases themselves) and the substitution of other sources of ***energy*** for OPEC oil. One important alternative source has been non-OPEC oil, some of which may not be economically viable at prices below Dollars 10 per barrel. For Europe another important substitute has been ***nuclear energy*** - which accounted for only 3 per cent of Europe's electricity in 1973 but over 25 per cent today. If the much reduced oil prices lead to a world economic upturn, OPEC's position will be as highly geared on the way up as it was on the way down and it seems unlikely that we shall be any less glad to be able to turn to ***nuclear*** fuels in that event than we were on the previous rounds.

***Nuclear energy*** was an economic proposition before the ***energy*** price hikes of the 1970s because, although the alternative fossil fuels were cheap, capital plant costs were much lower in real terms. Some writers from the ***nuclear*** industry predicted that high fossil fuel prices would be bad for ***nuclear*** power because they would push up capital costs and lead to an economic downturn and a slump in orders for power plants, and this is indeed what happened. If we are now to see a return to lower ***energy*** prices we should also see the fall in capital costs which tends to favour capital-intensive systems like ***nuclear*** power, and rates of economic growth to produce the economies of replication that have eluded ***nuclear*** power constructors in all but a few countries, and the conversion of the economic case for new ***nuclear*** plants into one for new firm power instead of system cost savings alone.

Swings and roundabouts effects like these make it unwise for commentators to leap in and say that a change in a single economic variable will overnight render some enterprise "hopelessly uneconomic." The world is not as simple as that.

Dr L G Brookes,

16, Ipswich Road,

Bournemouth, Hants.
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The 18th century Swiss mathematician Daniel Bernoulli spent a great deal of time trying to figure out why no one in his right mind would pay very much at all to play the following game: A coin is tossed repeatedly into the air until it falls heads up. If a head is attained on the first toss, the player wins $2, and the game's over. If it takes two tosses for a head to turn up, the payoff is $4. And if it takes three tosses, the prize doubles once again. Nineteen tails in a row, for example, would yield a prize of $1,048,576.

Although the probability of tossing 19 tails in a row is very small, the prize for doing so is commensurately large, and as a result, the expected monetary value of playing the game is infinite! Yet no rational person would pay much to play this game.

We do, however, play a similar game when it comes to ***nuclear energy***. While the probability of a reactor meltdown may be small indeed, this week's tragedy at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** facility in the Soviet Union may just prove that the associated costs are astronomical. And just as in Bernoulli's game, the mathematical "expected cost" of ***nuclear*** power may be much higher than we have ever dared to believe.

Just two months ago, Vitali Sklydarov, the Ukraine's minister of power and electrification said that the odds of a meltdown at Chernobyl were one in 10,000 years. But he didn't reel off any statistics on the costs that Soviet society would bear if that one highly unlikely meltdown just happened to occur.

By the same token, Ontario Hydro keeps telling us that the risks of a major catastrophe are minimal here. But again, they don't tell us the price we would pay if the next-to-impossible were to take place. But the unthinkable has to be taken into full account if we want an accurate statistical assessment of what the true economic costs of ***nuclear*** power in Ontario might be. As the Bernoulli game demonstrates, the cost difference between a small risk and a zero risk can be very large indeed.

If we were to make those calculations, then we might decide that ***nuclear energy*** isn't such a bargain after all. We might begin to explore the alternatives that we are fortunate enough to have. And we might begin to wonder why we've had a national oil policy (misnamed the National ***Energy*** Program), but we've never really had a national ***energy*** policy. Is it simply because there are more provinces producing electricity than oil in a nation in which federal-provincial tensions run high?

While Ontario proceeds merrily along building Darlington, Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa is searching for American customers to help develop the vast hydroelectric potential of his province. He hopes to generate 12,000 megawatts of safe, renewable power for export - more than three times as much as Darlington will produce. But the project is expected to cost only 2.3 times as much.

So far, the Ontario government has expressed little enthusiasm publicly for a partnership with Quebec. One reason may be that the cost of transmitting power from northern Quebec to Toronto is greater than the narrowly defined cost of ***nuclear energy***, even though hydro power is significantly cheaper to produce.

Provincial jealousies being what they are, an equally likely explanation might be that the Ontario government couldn't bring itself to "trade" construction jobs in Ontario for Quebec's safe electricity supplies.

And a third possible explanation for Ontario's apparent lack of enthusiasm is the role ***nuclear*** power plays in the the province's current industrial mix. After all, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney is hoping to sell a CANDU reactor to the South Koreans during his Asian trip.

As thousands of Soviets flee the radiation clouds over Chernobyl and the world price for oil hovers around $10 a barrel, we should ask ourselves what we're trying to do. Oil sands development in Alberta and frontier exploration have come to a standstill, Quebec is looking to the Americans, and Ontario is building more ***nuclear*** plants. And no one seems to be balancing the costs.

If there's an ***energy*** strategy in all this, I'm sure I don't know what it is. But in Ontario, one thing is certain: We should be calculating what it really costs to stay in the ***nuclear*** game.

\* Nate Laurie is a member of The Star's editorial board.
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The accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** reactor has so far caused no significant danger to health in any Western country, the ***Nuclear Energy*** Agency in Paris said yesterday.

The statement was made after the first full assessment of the agency's safety committee since the accident a fortnight ago.

The agency, which represents 23 industrial countries in the non-Communist world, said that it did not at present see the need for significant changes in western safety procedures for ***nuclear*** installations. But it would intensify pressure for increased global co-operation on ***nuclear*** safety, including that with the Soviet Union.

The safety committee agreed that present evidence suggested that radiation levels outside the Soviet bloc had not exceeded a tenth of the international safety limit of 2,000 becquerels per litre, except in a few highly localised instances.

With the need for greater international co-operation in mind, West Germany offered yesterday to host a special conference of the 26 nations operating ***nuclear*** power stations to agree on common safety standards and emergency reporting procedures.

Bonn urged that a meeting of the governors of the Vienna-based international Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, due in mid-June, should be brought forward to next week.

Chancellor Helmut Kohl has written personally to Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, demanding a full explanation of this worst-ever accident in the history of civil ***nuclear*** power.

The moves reflect Bonn's dismay at the Soviet Union's continuing failure to provide more information about Chernobyl. But it also clearly has continuing unrest and anxiety at home about the after-affects of the calamity very much in mind.

More than 5,000 people demonstrated yesterday at Gorleben, the site of an intermediate ***nuclear*** waste storage facility in Lower Saxony, where an important state election is due in a month's time.

Simultaneously, the opposition Social Democrats, at an economic congress in Hamburg, renewed their demand for West Germany to reduce dependence on ***nuclear energy***.

Britain is preparing to wind down the ***nuclear*** alert prompted by Chernobyl, Mr William Waldegrave, Environment Minister, said yesterday.

The announcement came as a Soviet Embassy official was summoned to the Foreign Office to hear further complaints about his Government's handling of the disaster.

Mr Timothy Eggar, Foreign Office Under-Secretary, told him of the need for prompt release of facts about a ***nuclear*** accident, and of fears about continuing effects.

Britain's ***nuclear*** industry yesterday accepted criticism by a Commons committee of its failure to allay public fear of radioactive waste, but said that disposal of ***nuclear*** waste ought to cause only negligible concern.

A ***nuclear*** reactor at the Hinkley Point B ***Nuclear*** Power Station in Somerset was shut down yesterday because of an electrical fault in a generator.

The plant was being inspected and repaired and the reactor should be reopened within a week, the Central Electricity Generating Board said.

In Italy pressure is mounting within the ruling five-party coalition for the Government to close one of the country's three functioning ***nuclear*** power plants. The plant, at Latina, south of Rome, is of the Magnox type, similar to several plants in Britain.

The demand for the closure of the 150 Mw plant comes from the executive of the Socialist Party, which is led by Mr Bettino Craxi, the Prime Minister. Other parties in the coalition, notably the Christian Democrats and Republicans, oppose what they regard as an alarmist line on ***nuclear energy***.

Premature close of the Latina plant would be a severe setback to Italy's ***nuclear*** programme. Apart from the three existing plants, Italy has one under construction, of the boiling-water reactor type, and plans to build at least three plants of the PWR (pressurised water reactor) type.

Italy obtained a further delay yesterday of 24 hours on introduction of a European Community ban on imports of fresh fruit, vegetables and dairy products from Eastern Europe to allow time for further discussions on the safe level of radioactivity.

National experts were meeting in Brussels to decide acceptable levels, which Italy fears could affect her own farm exports to other member-states because the proposed maximum radiation levels could be lower than those already found in some Italian provinces.

France took unilateral action last night to ban imports of food from Eastern bloc countries, saying that the Chernobyl disaster had caused a safety risk for French consumers.
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***Nuclear-energy*** critic Edward Markey, faced with an uprising on the House ***Energy*** and Commerce subcommittee he chairs, has pledged to initiate talks among diverse interest groups aimed at forging a licensing reform bill satisfactory to all sides. Markey, D-Mass., also has slated an April 29 hearing on public participation in licensing reform.

Word of the talks and the hearing was relayed in April 15 letters from Markey to nine Republicans and Democrats on his ***energy*** conservation and power subcommittee, all of whom have pressed the chairman for action on dormant licensing legislation (*IE/FL,* 31 March, 1).

Markey claimed credit for already having contacted various interest groups in an effort to reach a compromise over the contentious issue. "Indeed, my staff and I had been working to initiate discussions among outside interested parties on this issue for some time prior to the date of yours letter," he said. Markey's colleagues had written him March 24.

But a Markey aide acknowledged that the pressure applied by the subcommittee members, who together represent a majority of the panel, had had an impact. Said the aide: "We can count."

Markey said that a wide range of parties, including utilities, vendors, architect-engineers, environmentalists, consumer groups and "counsel with litigating experience on both sides of the [***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission] licensing procedures," planned to participate in the talks. Markey is leaving it up to the groups to organize the meetings themselves, the aide said. No dates have been set, although Markey expressed hope that the talks will proceed "expeditiously and productively."

"I look to these discussions to refine the issues surrounding the licensing reform and plant standardization debate and to see if a consensus bill could emerge which addresses our respective concerns and the overarching concern we all share to provide safe, reliable and affordable power to consumers," Markey said.

The subcommittee has held two earlier hearings on licensing legislation -- one last July and the other in December. Markey said "no other subcommittee in Congress has devoted as much time" to the licensing issue as his panel. "That effort reflects my commitment, which I have demonstrated in the other business before the subcommittee, to address controversial issues in a cooperative and deliberate fashion," he said.

Markey also notified officials of 14 organizations of his hopes for licensing talks. Contacted were officials of the Edison Electric Institute, the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council, the American Public Power Assn., the Atomic Industrial Forum, the Sierra Club, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Consumer Federation of America, the Environmental Policy Institute, the ***Nuclear*** Information & Resources Service, Environmental Action, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Critical Mass, U.S. PIRG and Friends of the Earth.

[*http://www.platts.com*](http://www.platts.com)
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THE NEW FRENCH GOVERNMENT PROBABLY WILL MAKE NO MAJOR CHANGES in French ***nuclear energy*** policy, according to French ***nuclear*** industry sources. Although the Conservatives were responsible for launching the country's ambitious program of standardized LWRs in the mid-1970s and defended that choice in the 1981 presidential election campaign against the Socialists, new Prime Minister Jacques Chirac and his cabinet are expected to live with the changes that economics and five years of Socialist government have wrought in the French ***nuclear*** program. Indeed, the reduction of the pace of reactor ordering from France from six to eight units a year in the late 1970s to one a year beginning in 1986 is more a function of electricity demand growth -- lower than predicted when the right was last in power -- than of an antinuclear bent on the part of the Socialists.

In fact, the previous government agreed to authorize one 1,300- to 1,500-MW PWR order a year between 1986 and 1989, despite the lack of need for the power from those units, in order to preserve the domestic ***nuclear*** industry. Industry officials acknowledge that it is quite possible the Conservative coalition, had they won the 1981 elections, would have taken the same ***nuclear energy*** policy decisions, albeit less abruptly and with less fanfare. Reactor builder Framatome, which speaks for a whole bevy of subcontractors threatened with slow extinction, has maintained that one unit a year is not enough to preserve the industry, and it has some hope that this message will reach the ears of the new team in Paris.

"Maybe they will raise the pace of (PWR unit) orders to 1-1/2 or 2 a year," said Framatome secretary-general, Gilbert Darmon. "But it's too early for any clear signs." One factor of unknown significance is the presence on the new cabinet of former Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique chairman and Minister of Industry Andre Giraud, credited with having put his personal prestige behind the ***nuclear*** power program in the late 1970s. Giraud has been named Minister of Defense in the Chirac government. An open and urgent question remains the new government's position regarding the future of the fast breeder reactor, an issue on which the Socialist government was relatively cool. Unless a mechanism can be worked out for European collaboration on the breeder -- or unless the new French government decides to revive plans for a strictly national breeder program -- breeder designer-contractor Novatome, a 70% Framatome subsidiary, faces a dramatic drop in activity once studies on a 1,500-MW Super Phenix-2 breeder are completed next year.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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With little oil, coal or water power, Israel counts on the ***nuclear*** alternative as a future ***energy*** source. But the Chernobyl disaster has raised serious safety questions, especially for a tiny country with no place to run.

"If Israel had an accident at one of the proposed ***nuclear*** power stations, just where could we evacuate the people?" columnist Dvora Ben-Shaul asked in the English-language Jerusalem Post. "No one knows how much area they evacuated in the Soviet Union and no one knows if it was enough."

Since the April 26 accident at the Soviet Chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant, Israeli officials have reaffirmed their intention to continue negotiating with France for construction of a ***nuclear*** power station in the Negev Desert. Currently, the Israelis have only two small experimental reactors in operation.

***Energy*** Minister Moshe Shahal said Israel "should enter the Atomic Age … and should not be deterred because of the Soviet disaster," although the final decision on the power plant would depend on economic considerations.

The United States has refused to sell Israel a ***nuclear*** generating plant, since the Israelis reject the ***Nuclear*** Non-Proliferation Treaty, which would require them to submit to international inspection to ensure they are not manufacturing ***nuclear*** weapons.

***Energy*** Ministry spokesman Avishai Amir said the negotiations with the French, which began in 1982, were still preliminary, but he said a ***nuclear*** station probably would supply about 1,000 megawatts, or one-sixth of Israel's electricity consumption in the year 2000.

It would cost about $2 billion. Israel's fuel imports cost $1.5 billion last year.

After the Chernobyl accident, Atomic ***Energy*** Commission officials held a news conference to reassure the public that Israel's ***nuclear*** safety standards were higher than those at Soviet plants. But the opposition to ***nuclear energy***, for economic, security and environmental reasons, also became more vocal.

Even the man considered the father of Israeli ***nuclear*** science, Yuval Neeman, voiced reservations, saying the project was uneconomical at a time when the price of imported oil had dropped from more than $30 to about $10 a barrel.

Eshel Ben-Yaakov, a Tel Aviv University physics professor, warned of the risk of a terrorist or air attack.

Serious damage to an Israel reactor "would wipe out the existence of the state. A large part of the population would be occupied with cancer and the rest \_ with giving birth to deformed children. You're putting your shirt on it. If someone manages to damage the reactor, that's it," Ben-Yaakov said in an interview with the weekly Koteret Rashit.

Neeman said that if a reactor were built at all, it should be underground, to guard against sabotage or air bombardment by Israel's Arab enemies.

But former President Ephraim Katzir, a leading scientist, said Israel's security can be enhanced by shifting to ***nuclear energy***.

"With oil and coal, we are very dependent on foreign sources," he said. "We want to be free from dependency."
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The Soviet ***nuclear*** disaster is causing serious worry in Latin America, where governments have been trying to develop atomic power despite a regional economic crisis.

Except for Cuba, most of the countries had to cut back their plans for lack of money. Now, the meltdown of a Soviet reactor is creating second thoughts about ***nuclear***-generated electricity.

In Cuba, 90 miles south of Florida, President Fidel Castro has boasted repeatedly that four planned reactors there are being built with the best of Soviet technology.

The reactors, scheduled to begin operating in 1989, were designed by Soviet specialists and are being built by Cuban and Bulgarian workers. Indications are the Cubans will proceed with their plan despite recent financial problems.

But now, countries like Argentina, Brazil and Mexico that have delayed or cut back their plans are suddenly faced with new worries about safety.

Mexicans have special cause for concern. Only 2 1/2 years ago, a worker stole some Cobalt-60 from a hospital in Ciudad Juarez, across the border from El Paso, Texas, and sold it to a junkyard, setting off a serious release of radiation.

The 44-pound cylinder used in cancer treatments was melted for scrap, contaminating 6,000 tons of steel later used to make construction rods and metal tables and chairs. An estimated 500 tons of the "hot" steel entered the United States before being detected.

Much of that steel has been retrieved and buried in six mammoth concrete coffins in northern Mexico's Samalayuca desert. The government declared the emergency over and the matter was virtually forgotten until this week.

But the Soviet accident at Chernobyl has revived worries about safety at the Laguna Verde plant on the Gulf of Mexico, which is supposed to be tested this year and go into operation in 1987.

"The accident calls for reflection. How will these installations fare facing international terrorism; how well prepared will we be in Mexico to control one of these failures in the Laguna Verde plant?" asked Mexico City's El Sol newspaper in an editorial Wednesday.

Laguna Verde was planned as the first of 10 to 20 plants, to be built with Mexican oil money by the year 2000 at an estimated cost of $20 billion. But sagging oil prices since 1982 have sent its economy into a tailspin from which it has yet to recover.

Started in 1978, Laguna Verde was delayed several times by technical problems, some of them reportedly involving safety. The ***Nuclear*** Research Institute recently claimed it has trained people and the necessary equipment to deal with almost any problem that might develop.

Perhaps, the newspaper Excelsior suggested, the entire concept of ***nuclear energy*** should be re-examined.

"The peaceful use of the atom to generate ***energy*** is very far still from being perfected and the risks for the ecology are immense … there exists no standard design for reactors and the countries involved in their development adopt jealous attitudes so as not to share their technology in this area," it said.

Brazilians jokingly call their only functioning reactor, built by Westinghouse near Rio de Janeiro, "vagalume," or firefly in Portuguese, because it constantly goes on and off due to maintenance problems. But so far there have been no leaks.

"Vagalume" was part of a plan initiated in the 1970's to build nine reactors with West German technology as the best answer to Brazil's chronic fuel shortage. The country has virtually no usable petroleum deposits.

But economic difficulties reduced the project to only two more plants \_ and doubts are now developing about these because of the Soviet incident.

"Does this incident and former ones justify rethinking the use of ***nuclear energy*** for military and peaceful ends?" asked Sao Paulo's influential newspaper O Estado.

Considered Latin America's leader in ***nuclear energy***, Argentina confidently fired up in 1974 the first of six reactors plants it planned to build by the year 2000. A second one was started in 1983, and a third is due for completion by 1990.

But that plan, too, has been pruned for lack of money. Now Argentines are having second thoughts about the entire project.

"While the radioactive cloud resulting from the (Soviet) accident moves across the skies of northern Europe, men and women from all over the world worriedly wonder about the possibility that someday something similar might occur where they live," Argentina's largest circulation daily, Clarin, warned in an editorial Wednesday.
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The Austrian Cabinet on May 13 effectively killed every vestigial hope that Zwentendorf, the country's never-used 742-MW BWR, would ever start up, making the plant the first official Western political casualty of the Chernobyl accident.

Federal Chancellor Fred Sinowatz said categorically after the cabinet meeting: "Zwentendorf is dead." So, he seemed to suggest, was ***nuclear energy*** in Austria, though he added that imports of ***nuclear***-generated electrical power will continue, mainly from Switzerland. He himself had always been a protagonist of ***nuclear energy***, the chancellor said, but in the aftermath of Chernobyl he was looking at it from another viewpoint.

Before Chernobyl, there had been indications that political opinion had shifted and that the referendum that kept Zwentendorf closed might be reversed, especially because of Austria's dependence on imported electricity (NW, 17 April, 10). Bechtel is scheduled to complete next month a study of options for selling off Zwentendorf, whole or in parts, and Zwentendorf proponents hoped the study would show the public that economics greatly favored operation.

Sinowatz said he was also contacting the West German government to ask for reconsideration of the proposed reprocessing plant in Wackersdorf, close to the Austrian border. That project was controversial in Germany even before Chernobyl (NuclearFuel, 21 April, 2). Asked if he seriously believed the Germans would listen to the plea, Sinowatz said, "Of course," but added that there are questions of safety that must discussed in the light of the accident in the Ukraine. He expected the discussions to be "constructive," he said.

With a presidential poll coming up June 12, there are no defenders of the ***nuclear*** option on the Austrian political scene. Even the Austrian industrialists association made only feeble noises in favor of "keeping the door open" on all forms of ***energy***. The group then added that hydro power should now be built up vigorously and that the government should give "full backing" to this sector.

Last week, marketers of hothouse vegetables were warning their supplies were nearly exhausted, but the Health Ministry on May 13 said it could not predict a date when restrictions on foods grown in the open -- and potentially exposed to Chernobyl fallout -- would be lifted. The ministry did lift restrictions on sheep milk and cheese, though testing for contamination is still required. Austrian consumers were being warned against buying cheap but unreliable radioactivity measuring devices, deer hunters were told to wait until next month to hunt because of the iodine and cesium levels being found in venison, and Vienna's city government issued special instructions to citizens on how to prepare for and protect themselves from ***nuclear*** accident fallout.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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THE ACCIDENT AT A SOVIET ***NUCLEAR*** POWER PLANT WILL BE TAKEN UP AT THE TOKYO SUMMIT MAY 4-6, JAPANESE GOVERNMENT SOURCES SAID WEDNESDAY.

THE SOURCES SAID PRIME MINISTER YASUHIRO NAKASONE AND FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIALS ARE STUDYING WHAT ACTION TO TAKE.

THE SOVIET UNION HAS CALLED FOR AID FROM WEST GERMANY AND OTHER WESTERN COUNTRIES TO PUT OUT THE BLAZE AT ONE OF THE FOUR REACTORS AT THE CHERNOBYL POWER PLANT NORTH OF KIEV.

AT LEAST TWO PEOPLE WERE KILLED IN THE ACCIDENT, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL NEWS AGENCY TASS, BUT UNCONFIRMED REPORTS PUT THE DEATH TOLL AT 2,000.

93 .8,8'546 '974:3' '-8$ 5#3 -::8$3,5 28) MPACT ON BOTH DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION LED BY PARTY GENERAL SECRETARY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV.

ANALYSIS OF THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP IS A MAJOR TOPIC OF POLITICAL DISCUSSION AT THE SUMMIT HOSTED BY NAKASONE FOR LEADERS FROM SIX OTHER WESTERN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACIES.

JAPANESE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WILL HOLD AN EMERGENCY MEETING TO DISCUSS THE ACCIDENT, THE SOURCES SAID.

JAPANESE EXPERTS SAID THE LEVEL OF RADIATION LEAKED FROM THE FACILITY MAY BE EQUAL TO LEVELS IN HIROSHIMA FOLLOWING THE DROPPING OF THE WORLD'S FIRSERE RECORDED IN SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES ALMOST 1,600 KILOMETERS AWAY.

THE JAPANESE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AGENCY HAS STARTED MONITORING AT 32 STATIONS ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO CHECK FOR INCREASES IN RADIATION LEVELS.

BUT, EIICHI TSUJI, CHIEF OF THE AGENCY'S ATOMIC ***ENERGY*** SAFETY BUREAU, SAID, "THERE WILL BE ONLY A VERY SMALL EFFECT ON JAPAN FROM THE RADIATION LEAK, IF ANY, BECAUSE OF THE DISTANCE."

THE POWER STATION IS ABOUT 8,000 KILOMETERS WEST OF JAPAN.

RADIATION FROM THE CRIPPLED POWER STATION COULD REACH JAPAN ABOUT 40 HOURS AFTER THE ACCIDENT.

KIEV CITY AUTHORITIES TOLD KYODO NEWS SERVICE THE ACCIDENT OCCURRED SATURDAY NIGHT.

TASS SAID K69);3$ 9,3 9! 5 E MODERATOR REACTORS AT THE POWER PLANT.

THE JAPANESE AGENCY SAID 46 ***NUCLEAR*** POWER PLANTS ARE IN OPERATION OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN JAPAN, AND CURRENTLY SUPPLY ABOUT A QUARTER OF THE COUNTRY'S ELECTRICITY.

BUT THE JAPANESE REACTORS ARE "COMPLETELY" DIFFERENT IN STRUCTURE FROM THE REACTOR AT THE SOVIET POWER STATION, AN OFFICIAL AT THE AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ***ENERGY*** SAID.

REPORTS OF THE ACCIDENT SHOCKED JAPANESE ELECTRIC POWER COMPANIES WHO ARE PLANNING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ***NUCLEAR*** POWER PLANTS.

"WE ARE CONCERNED THAT THE ACCIDENT MAY HINDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF ***NUCLEAR ENERGY***," AN ELECTRIC INDUSTRY SOURCES SAID.

TOMIO SUDO, CHIEF OF TOKAI VILLAGE IN IBARAKI PREFECTURE, CALLED THE ACCIDENT "UNBELIEVABLE," AND SAID HE WILL CALL ON THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO TAKE EFFECTIVE SAFETY MEASURES FOR ***NUCLEAR*** POWER FACILITIES IN THE PACIFIC COAST COMMUNITY NORTHEAST OF TOKYO, WHICH IS KNOWN AS THE "MECCA" OF THE JAPANESE ATOMIC ***ENERGY*** INDUSTRY.

BUT AN ANTINUKE ACTIVIST IN THE VILLAGE REACTED DIFFERENTLY.

"WE HAVE EXPECTED THIS KIND OF ACCIDENT," SAID KAZUMASA AIZAWA, WHO HAS BEEN PUSHING A LEGAL BATTLE TO SCRAP ***NUCLEAR*** POWER PLANTS.

"THE ACCIDENT HAS RENEWED OUR DETERMINATION TO TACKLE DEVELOPMENT OF NON-***NUCLEAR ENERGY*** SOURCES," HE ADDED.

**Load-Date:** January 1, 2012
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Should we be afraid of ***nuclear*** power? No more than we should of being struck dead by a meteorite falling out of the sky!

This week the North American media have gone to town on the Soviet ***nuclear*** power station disaster. In the absence of hard facts, every rumor and crackpot theory has been given headline treatment. Feeding on our natural fear of radiation, newspapers and television stations have often left people with the impression that the end of the world was at hand. "2,000 Dead in Nuke Disaster," trumpeted The Toronto Sun on the basis of no more than speculation. The Star's own contribution was a color map on the front page showing an ominous green arrow representing radiation that would soon swathe Canada. Further down the page we learned that Health Minister Jake Epp says the radiation when it gets here will be so diluted as to pose no threat.

Terms like "melt-down" were tossed around like confetti and every pronouncement from the U.S. State Department - which isn't exactly enamored of the Soviet Union - was suddenly treated as Bible truth.

Criminal neglect

We should be concerned about the Soviet accident. It seems to have resulted from a criminal neglect for safety. But if we let ourselves be caught up in the mood of hysteria that is being fanned by those who oppose ***nuclear*** power (aided and abetted by the media) we will pay a very high price.

There are many who want us to believe the province of Ontario is a ticking bomb, that Ontario Hydro's commitment to ***nuclear energy*** (which supplies 40 per cent of our power now, 65 per cent by 1992) will lead to the kind of situation they're facing in the Ukraine.

A couple of days ago I went to see Professor John Runnalls, who is chairman of Hydro's technical advisory committee, chairman for the University of Toronto's Centre for ***Nuclear*** Engineering, and one of Canada's most distinguished ***nuclear*** scientists. I asked him some of the questions that many Canadians had on their minds this week.

Why, for instance, should we believe our scientists' assurances when only last week Soviet scientists were saying the same things? Western scientists, said Runnalls, have known for a long time that the Soviet ***nuclear*** program was dangerously risky. Because they don't have to answer to the public, he said, they have built ***nuclear*** reactors in buildings as flimsy as suburban factories.

The Soviets encased their fuel in blocks of graphite - the stuff that's now burning so fiercely. The tubes containing the fuel in Canadian Candu reactors are surrounded by water. As an additional protection the new reactors being installed at Darlington, east of Oshawa, will have an emergency injection cooling system, and all Hydro's other reactors are being retrofitted with the same system. If the pressure goes up even moderately, a vacuum chamber immediately sucks off the air like a giant vacuum cleaner. Beyond that, the reactors are housed in concrete buildings with four-foot (1.2-metre) thick walls.

Wind ***energy***

But why, I asked Runnalls, do we even need ***nuclear energy***? What about all the untapped water, sun and wind ***energy***?

If all the available water in Ontario was tapped it would only account for the growth in our power needs for one year, he said. Wind? It would take 450,000 windmills to supply little Prince Edward Island with its power needs. The wind velocity there is twice what it is in Ontario. The sun? Fine for limited uses, such as heating buildings, but we're a long way from getting any significant amount of power that way.

The fact is, said Runnalls, Ontario's appetite for power, after a long lull, is growing at a fast clip - close to 5 per cent. And it is just because we made the commitment to ***nuclear*** power in the 1950s that, for instance, our electricity is half the price it is in Detroit and General Motors is now building a $2 billion plant at Oshawa. Sure we could build coal or oil power stations instead - if we want to kill every lake with acid rain and pay an extra 50 per cent for our power.

Professor Runnalls and I share one thing in common. We are grandfathers. That makes you think not just about this generation but the next one and the one after that. I have visited several of Ontario's ***nuclear*** power stations, read about them, talked to both sides. I believe, as he does, that long after we are dead from cigarette smoke, car fumes and meteorites that fall from the sky, there will still be people standing on the lawns at Queen's Park shouting, "It's ***nuclear energy*** that's gonna get ya!"
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What Three Mile Island did for the American power utilities Chernobyl has done for the whole of ***nuclear*** science. It has toppled it from its high horse. It has compelled the ***nuclear*** community to communicate down-to-earth stuff. And for the first time ***nuclear*** engineers have conceded that their 'million-to-one infallibility' depended not upon their superb science but upon the continuous reliability of less exotic things like pumps, simple electronics and concrete vessels.

Reactors must not only be fool-proof but also be fear-proof if people are going to like them. Chernobyl will no doubt again prove that ***nuclear*** safety and reliability is not about reactor design as such but is really about the actual quality of its engineering.

It is perfectly true that in the United States a ***nuclear*** plant has not been ordered for almost ten years. The earlier reasons being that ***nuclear*** power had lost its competitive edge. Since Three Mile Island however, the more significant brake on ***nuclear*** construction has been public apprehension. But after Chernobyl the ***nuclear*** climb-back worldwide may be long and difficult.

But should Britain and West Germany succumb to pressure and phase-out its ***nuclear*** programme and all its reprocessing plant it would indeed be bad news. For the Third World it would be a major setback because of the influence the British and German decision would have upon their own development.

Analysis shows that ***nuclear*** power can be made perfectly safe and rather than argue abolition anti-***nuclear*** pressure groups should demand that absolute safety remain the first consideration and that cost be very much a secondary matter. The social, environmental and Third World nutritional benefits of ***nuclear*** power are so outstanding that governments (Euratom and the Soviet CMEA for example) should agree to subsidising the industry if necessary.

Not one incident has been a failure due to bad or insufficient understanding of the ***nuclear*** fuel cycle. Since Lord Rutherford first published his Theory of Radioactivity in 1904 ***nuclear*** physicists have consistently developed their knowledge of ***nuclear*** science and even promised a foreseeable end to the smog-ridden acid polluted world created by the endless burning of fossil fuels. The Greens of course argue that atom bombs were the incentive. Not so. Physicists have long been genuine environmentalists and good park-keepers. But for reasons debated elsewhere American money was poured into atomic research in order to prioritise Hiroshima and subsequently the so-called atomic deterrent.

It is particularly important in my opinion that the Labour Party and radicals generally should not appear to be anti-science. It is even more important that a clear distinction be made between atoms and atoms for war and that the existence of a ***nuclear*** power industry (including the integration and use of fast reactors in the system) does not necessarily mean the manufacture of ***nuclear*** weapons. I mention all this because there is a powerful case in terms of socialist ethics in favour of ***nuclear*** power. For myself, as a passionate opponent of ***nuclear*** weapons, I am equally passionate in recognising the necessity for the safe development of ***nuclear energy***.

Consider first future ***energy*** prospects for Britain. Both the Wilson and Callaghan governments were ultimately broken by massive balance-of-payments deficits due mainly to the import of oil. Thatcher inherited the richest legacy ever bequeathed to government. Fortuitously, British oil production has risen from million tonnes in 1983. Had Labour governments in the past not concentrated on the development of North Sea oil Britain today would have been compelled to introduce strict import controls and the City would never have enjoyed its multi-billion bonanza.

Certainly most pits would still be working and Britain would not be building its first processing plants to convert coal to liquid fuel and gas. Expensive yes - but absolutely essential in view of what would have been a fuel-starved Britain.

We can go even further and try to imagine a future for Britain without ***nuclear energy***. The outlook would be grim. And for socialists particularly there could be political problems - transitionary problems. In exactly the same way that neither scientists nor technologists can short-circuit or skip a stage in the ordered progression of their own work neither can any pluralistic democracy skip a stage in its own development. Socialist ethics, if they mean anything, must represent a higher and more cultured code of behaviour than, say, the ethics of an aggressive free market and competitive society.

That is why class-divided nations struggling to overcome absolute economic deprivation can never reach a classless democracy in one leap. In today's terms advanced industrialised society must progress via high-tech and advanced science. In other words a socialist transition is synonymous with affluent production and a massive ***energy*** supply.

On a world seale it has been estimated that by the year 2020 ***energy*** demand will rise beyond 500 million barrels (oil equivalent) per day. Mercifully oil itself still accounts for over 40 per cent of all world wide ***energy*** but oil production has already peaked. Where then is the rest of the ***energy*** required to come from? If places like India and SE Asia and part of Africa are to have tap water and good sanitation and to have enough protein today's world consumption of around 350 million barrels (oil equivalent) per day will have to double over a period of 25 to 30 years.

Socialists who now argue for an end to all ***nuclear*** power must provide answers. The ***energy*** shortfall is going to be an awful lot. Wind power can provide a little - wave power a bit more - but in most places where people now starve there is neither wind nor water. Only more ***energy*** can provide more protein. Only ***nuclear*** power can provide desalination and irrigation schemes. Only ***nuclear*** power can help provide economic synthetic fuels.

Certainly an anti-***nuclear*** attitude is now widespread throughout the aid movement. It has bitten deep into the minds of otherwise progressive thinkers. Socialists in particular must demonstrate that they care and work towards concrete remedies. Not just say that Chernobyl represents the last straw and drift off into some stop-the-lot syndrome.

Last year's Annual Conference of the Labour Party demonstrated the point. The Conference decided to abandon ***nuclear energy*** and because enriched uranium and names like plutonium apply to both reactors and bombs the debate became emotionally confused. This year it is likely to be even worse.

Finally the issue which worries most people and is likely to bring down the whole edifice - the disposal of ***nuclear*** waste. The world's experts now claim that there are no scientific problems. The difficulties are public fear and money. Clearly then the ball is in the Government's court. The selection of sites must be by public agreement and the techniques used must not be designed by accounts obsessed with costs. The nation needs ***nuclear energy*** and the nation must act responsibly and pay adequately for the safe disposal of its waste.

Norman Atkinson is Labour MP for Tottenham.
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Fast development of big ***nuclear*** plants, each with an ultimate capacity

of 4,000 to 7,000 megawatts, is at the centre of Soviet investment in

***energy*** west of the Ural Mountains during the next five years and is bound

to be affected by the destruction of the reactor in the Ukraine.

The very high speed with which the ***nuclear*** program was being pushed may

have contributed to the disaster. In 1984, Peter Neporozhny, the Soviet

Minister for Power and Electrification, said: "Such power stations are

very economical and can be built in the immediate vicinity of a city

because they do not emit smoke and are totally safe."

Soviet ***nuclear*** power specialists have echoed the same theme - that

***nuclear energy*** for civil use is free of risk. "Over the 31 years that

passed since the first ***nuclear*** power unit went into operation there have

not been any serious accidents at Soviet ***nuclear*** power plants," wrote two

members of the staff at the Institute of ***Nuclear*** Power in Moscow last

year.

The decision to expand the ***nuclear*** power program was taken in 1984 when

the Soviet Union produced its ***energy*** program for the next 20 years. The

Soviet Union was then using about 2.5 million barrels a day of oil in its

power stations. The plan was to save oil by substituting natural gas and

by rapidly increasing the number of ***nuclear*** power stations.

In the European part of the country, studies showed that a kilowatt of

electricity produced from ***nuclear*** power stations was much the cheapest.

East of the Urals, cheap coal from open-cast pits and associated gas was

the most economic fuel.

About 40,000 megawatts of ***nuclear energy*** were to be added between 1986

and 1990 on top of the 23,000 megawatts already in place.

The new program created some misgivings. "Isn't a '***nuclear*** euphoria'

replacing the oil euphoria,' " Mr. Neporozhny was asked by an interviewer

two years ago at the start of the present spurt of ***nuclear*** plant

construction. He denied having "any delusions on this score."

Will the Chernobyl disaster affect the ***nuclear*** program? The investment

made is already very large. During the next 10 years, 30 ***nuclear*** power

stations are to be built. In 1986, about 7,500 more megawatts of

electricity from ***nuclear*** plants are to be produced, which means at least

seven new reactors.

The Atommash plant, which was originally meant to produce eight

reactors a year in serial production, has never come up to expectations

but is still thought to be producing about three reactors a year.

The program, which has absorbed so much Soviet capital investment in

the 1980s, will be almost impossible to change and difficult to modify.

Although the raw materials such as oil, coal and gas are available as

fuel, as well as plentiful hydro-electric power, they are already fully

used and are, in any case, in the wrong part of the country, in the

sparsely inhabited Siberian wastelands. That is too far for electricity to

be transmitted economically to the great industrial cities in the western

region.
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with parliamentary elections in the netherlands only four days away, there is still no clear sign as to which party will capture the majority and the keys to the future dutch government. latest public opinion polls show that of the dozen-odd political parties competing in the may 21 elections, the christian democratic appeal (cda) and the people's party for freedom and democracy (vvd), the center-right coalition now in power under prime minister ruud lubbers, together will win only 72 to 73 seats, or 75 seats at best, just short of a majority in the 150-seat parliament needed to form a new government. though cda could win 45 to 49 seats (it now has 45), its junior partner, the conservative vvd, may drop drastically from its present 36 seats to 26 seats. at the same time, the polls predict major gains of nine to 10 seats for the opposition labor party, the biggest party in the country, bringing labor's total to 56 or 57, which would be the highest total since its founding 40 years ago. the democrats'66 (d'66), another left-wing party, could gain about 10 seats, four or five seats more than the previous elections. observers here believe it's still difficult to predict the results of the elections, especially the subsequent make-up of a future government because politics in the netherlands are complicated. but widespread speculations hold that lubbers' center-right government will be replaced by a left one led by the opposition labor party, due to strong public opposition to the government's ***nuclear energy*** policy, which has been stepped-up since the soviet chernobyl plant accident. many dutch people aren't happy either with the government's plan to deploy american cruise missiles on their soil. however, one can be sure that it won't be easy for the cda-vvd coalition to retain its power, and nor will it be easy for the opposition labor party to capture it since neither force is seen as strong enough to gain a clear majority. what also seems clear to observers is that the next government, like all its predecessors since 1945, will be a coalition government. but this begs the question of who will join forces. cda and vvd have indicated their willingness to continue their four-year marriage of convenience despite differences on certain minor issues. in case they fail to gain a majority they prefer to have the d'66 with them in a tripartite coalition. however, the d'66, whose support might be enough to keep cda and vvd in power, is now taking a "wait and see" attitude and has even given signs of a possible alliance with labor. but even if the d'66 does decide to go with labor, the labor party won't have a majority needed to form a government.labor has tried very hard to form an alliance with the cda, which has made it clear that it will not join hands with labor because it is unwilling to compromise on the cruise missile issue, among others. the cda-vvd coalition remains committed to the government's decision last year to deploy 48 american cruise missiles on dutch soil by the end of 1988, while labor says that if it forms a government it will scrap the dutch-american missile deployment treaty. in spite of this, politicians haven't ruled out entirely a cda-labor alliance. ***nuclear energy*** policy also emerges as a crucial political issue that divides the ruling parties and the opposition, especially following the chernobyl accident. capitalizing on the accident, labor has sharply criticized the government's ***nuclear energy*** policy and has demanded that the government drop its plan to build four new ***nuclear*** power stations. the high unemployment rate, the problems with social security and the government's overall economic policy are also divisive issues. according to a survey, about 70 percent of the country's businessmen favor the continuation of the present coalition, while an overwhelming majority of blue collar workers support the labor party. recent public opinion polls also show that about 50 percent of the dutch people have confidence in lubbers and would like to see him remain as prime minister, while only 17 percent are in favor of den uyl, former prime minister and now the labor's floor leader in parliament. there's reason, then, for people to believe that the cda will be part of the new government as it has been part of every government since 1945.
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Word of mouth and two brief media announcements about a ***nuclear*** disaster in the Ukraine were all it took to alarm the Soviet people, who are accustomed to reading between the lines of brief government statements.

''Now it seems we're sitting on a ***nuclear*** time bomb,'' said a young Muscovite.

''Listen, when they (the official press) say there has been an accident, and then say it is a disaster, you know it is serious, very serious,'' said a middle-aged Moscow man. ''The problem is there is so much we don't know, and it worries us.''

According to Western diplomats and scientists, it worries the Soviet government too.

With an ambitious program to double the Soviet Union's ***nuclear*** capacity in the next five years and triple it by the year 2000, the Kremlin has much to lose if word of a major accident involving thousands of deaths reaches the Soviet populace.

''The Soviets are underplaying this whole thing so as not to arouse fear in the people and create objections to the ***nuclear energy*** program,'' a Western diplomat said.

Western diplomats in Moscow and the city's natives have been shocked by the announcements on Soviet television acknowledging the ***nuclear*** accident. They attribute the new -- yet limited -- government openness to recent calls by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev for more honesty.

The afternoon newspaper Izvestia reported the accident in a brief front-page announcement bordered by two thick black lines used rarely and only for major accidents such as airplane crashes and for the deaths of Soviet leaders.

The announcement said only that there had been an accident, but to Soviets the black lines meant only one thing: death.

The accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station near Kiev in the Ukraine likely affected many people. The nightly news program Vremya told millions of Soviet viewers that three populated areas around the plant had been evacuated.

The somber announcer also told viewers that two people died ''during the accident.'' Diplomats and Soviets took ''during'' to mean more probably died later.

A Kiev resident said she didn't have to read between the lines: ''It's a fact and anyone who knows anyone involved in the rescue knows that thousands died. The Oktyabrsky (October) Hospital is packed with injured.''

''What a nightmare, what unhappiness. There are no words,'' said a young Moscow writer.

Another Muscovite outside a train station expressed confusion, saying, ''***Nuclear energy*** is modern and clean. This could not happen.''

Tass has reported many times that ''the whole Soviet experience of operation of ***nuclear*** power stations … indicates that they are reliable and safe.''

But the official Soviet news agency stunned the nation by reporting for the first time, ''This accident and others at ***nuclear*** power stations in the West show that ***nuclear*** power, even when used for peaceful purposes, can be dangerous.''

''I can't believe it,'' said a young woman. ''We've never heard this before.''
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To Soviet citizens accustomed to reading between the lines of the official government newspaper Izvestia, the thick black borders around the small front-page story on the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** accident meant only one thing: death.

The afternoon newspaper's report was brief, but the two thick black lines are are rarely used, and only for major accidents such as airplane crashes and for the deaths of Soviet leaders.

The Izvestia report and a brief announcement on Soviet television, along with word of mouth in the streets of the capital, were enough to alarm the Soviet people.

''Now it seems we're sitting on a ***nuclear*** time bomb,'' said a young Muscovite.

''Listen, when they (the official press) say there has been an accident, and then say it is a disaster, you know it is serious, very serious,'' said a middle-aged Moscow man. ''The problem is there is so much we don't know, and it worries us.''

According to Western diplomats and scientists, the Soviet government is worried also.

With an ambitious program to double the Soviet Union's ***nuclear*** capacity in the next five years and to triple it by the year 2000, the Kremlin has much to lose if word of a major accident involving thousands of deaths reaches the Soviet populace.

''The Soviets are underplaying this whole thing so as not to arouse fear in the people and create objections to the ***nuclear energy*** program,'' a Western diplomat said.

Western diplomats in Moscow and the city's natives have been shocked by the announcements on Soviet television acknowledging the ***nuclear*** accident. They attribute the new -- yet limited -- disclosures to recent calls by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev for more openness in Soviet government.

The accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station near Kiev in the Ukraine likely affected many people. The nightly news program Vremya told millions of Soviet viewers that three populated areas around the plant had been evacuated.

The somber announcer also told viewers two people died ''during the accident.'' Diplomats and Soviets took ''during'' to mean more probably died later.

A Kiev resident said she didn't have to read between the lines: ''It's a fact and anyone who knows anyone involved in the rescue knows that thousands died. The Oktyabrsky (October) Hospital is packed with injured.''

''What a nightmare, what unhappiness. There are no words,'' said a young Moscow writer.

Another Muscovite outside a train station expressed confusion, saying, ''***Nuclear energy*** is modern and clean. This could not happen.''

Tass has reported many times that ''the whole Soviet experience of operation of ***nuclear*** power stations … indicates that they are reliable and safe.''

The official Soviet news agency stunned the nation by reporting for the first time, ''This accident and others at ***nuclear*** power stations in the West show that ***nuclear*** power, even when used for peaceful purposes, can be dangerous.''

''I can't believe it,'' said a young woman. ''We've never heard this before.''
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***Nuclear*** utility lobbyists are launching a wide-ranging effort to stave off adverse political fallout from the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** powerplant accident.

The Edison Electric Institute, the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council, the Atomic Industrial Forum and the Committee for ***Energy*** Awareness met behind closed doors May 2 to plan a public relations blitz to counter growing qualms in Congress, on Wall Street and among the public.

The campaign was kicked off May 8 by William S. Lee, chairman and chief executive officer of Duke Power.

Lee assured the analysts that U.S. plants are safe because of inherent reactivity controls and secondary containments. At a Washington news conference the next day, Lee acknowledged that "Chernobyl has caused an additional level of uneasiness about ***nuclear*** power" around the world.

The pro-***nuclear*** campaign is expected to peak in mid-May at a previously scheduled two-day legislative rally, during which hundreds of ***nuclear*** executives will urge legislators to renew the Price-Anderson ***nuclear*** liability insurance program. But the industry is jittery. The Committee for ***Energy*** Awareness -- a pro-***nuclear*** information clearinghouse -- decided to cancel some planned post-Chernobyl public opinion polling. CEA worried that the results would be too antinuclear.

[*URL: http://www.enr.com*](URL: http://www.enr.com)
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Two of China's vice premiers held a rare news conference Thursday, answering questions on topics ranging from Chinese-Soviet relations to plans for a colossal dam on the Yangtze River.

Li Peng and Yao Yilin faced foreign and Chinese reporters for two hours and 20 minutes in the Great Hall of the People.

Correspondents, who frequently complain about the lack of opportunity to meet and question Chinese leaders, asked about the Communist Party's anti-corruption campaign, leadership changes, ***nuclear energy***, a new bankruptcy law and other topics.

Li, 57, and Yao, 69, both Politburo members, displayed touches of humor and occasionally retreated from questions they didn't want to handle.

"***Nuclear*** power stations," Li interjected in English when his translator said China would rely on its own efforts to build "***nuclear*** weapons."

However, Li also said China will send a delegation to the Soviet Union to study ***nuclear*** power plants there and to make recommendations on technical cooperation in ***nuclear energy***.

"We hope that relations between China and the Soviet Union can be generally improved because we think that would be conducive to the peoples of our two countries and to peace and stability in the Far East and the world," Li said.

But he said Soviet border troops and Moscow's roles in Afghanistan and Cambodia posed continuing problems, and he indicated there was little progress when he met Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow last Dec. 23.

"Our two sides put forward our respective positions on international issues and on Sino-Soviet relations," Li said.

Yao announced plans to abolish China's special currency for foreigners, the "foreign exchange certificate," and make domestic renminbi (People's Money) the sole currency.

He also said communist China's first bankruptcy law is in preparation but will differ in contents from bankruptcy laws in capitalist countries.

Li said China will conduct further studies before deciding whether to build the proposed $20 billion Three Gorges hydroelectric project on the Yangtze River, which would displace up to 1 million people. He cited navigation and silting problems yet to be solved.

On other topics, Li said:

No major changes in the Chinese leadership are pending and it is too early to say what will happen at the 1987 party Congress.

The party is not "indiscriminately opposed" to state officials engaging in commerce. "What we oppose is their use of privileges to profiteer and make benefits for themselves."

Education spending will rise 72 percent this year, but it is "still not enough," there is a serious shortage of teachers and it will take 15 years to fully implement nine-year compulsory schooling.

China has not decided whether to participate in the 1986 Asian Games in Seoul, South Korea.

A small number of student protesters last autumn created "turbulence," but authorities used persuasion, not repression, to handle them. "We were rewarded by very good results."
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Day by day, since the Soviet ***nuclear*** disaster, reports have come in from around the world of major government reassessments and popular protests on the ***nuclear*** issue. Here is a comprehensive look at Chernobyl's impact in other nations.

Three Mile Island unsettled a ***nuclear*** world. Now Chernobyl has shaken it.

As radioactive dust fell over the Northern Hemisphere last week, governments abruptly scrapped or postponed new atomic-***energy*** programs. Election battle lines formed around the ***nuclear*** issue. And anti-***nuclear*** protesters marched by the thousands through the streets of world capitals \_ including even a handful in Soviet-bloc Poland.

The 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island plant, near Harrisburg, Pa., had a long-term impact. Within a year, for example, Swedes voted to phase out their ***nuclear***-power system, and the Chinese dropped plans for a plant near Shanghai.

But the repercussions of the April 26 disaster at the Soviet Union's Chernobyl plant, history's worst ***nuclear*** accident, have reached farther, faster \_ and promise to be longer-lasting.

Since Chernobyl, three governments \_ in Yugoslavia, the Philippines and the Netherlands \_ have put ***nuclear***-power plans on hold or written them off entirely, citing fears raised by the Soviet accident. And, from Taiwan to Mexico to Italy, legislators and editorialists are demanding major reassessments of atomic ***energy*** in their countries.

"Harrisburg all at once changed the domestic policy scene in Sweden," commented the Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter. "Chernobyl is on its way to do the same."

***Nuclear*** power provides one-sixth of the world's electricity. At the end of 1985, twenty-six nations had 374 licensed power reactors operating, 100 of them in the United States, the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency reports.

Reactor safety and radioactive-waste disposal have been troublesome political issues for decades. A U.S. General Accounting Office study, recently released, reported 151 safety incidents at ***nuclear*** plants in 14 countries between 1971 and 1984.

But the Chernobyl disaster was the first to spew radioactivity out over much of the world. In country after country, the disaster sent government officials, such as Italian ***nuclear energy*** chief Umberto Colombo, scrambling to reassure nervous publics.

"An incident of that gravity could not happen in Italy," Colombo said in Rome, just 40 miles from an Italian atomic plant that, like Chernobyl, uses graphite as a chain-reaction moderator.

The experts pointed to a safety margin \_ concrete containment structures surrounding their reactors \_ that the devastated Soviet reactor did not have. The containment at Three Mile Island proved to be the difference between threat and disaster.

But anti-***nuclear*** activists, meanwhile, have taken the offensive.

"It just isn't good enough to state glibly that our reactors are different from the Soviets'," said David Martin, a spokesman for the Canadian ***Nuclear*** Awareness group. "Any reactor system can melt down if there's a lack of coolant."

First to act in Chernobyl's aftermath was President Corazon Aquino's new Philippines government, which on April 30 decided to "mothball" an almost-finished ***nuclear*** power plant near Manila. It had long been viewed as an economic mistake, but the Soviet disaster made it easier to drop the $2.1-billion project.

Last Wednesday, Dutch Premier Ruud Lubbers, who faces an election May 21, postponed plans to build at least two more ***nuclear*** plants in Holland.

That same day, the Yugoslav press reported that plans for the Communist nation's second ***nuclear*** generating facility had been dropped. The state-supervised Politika Express newspaper went even further, saying Chernobyl made it clear ***nuclear*** power should be banned altogether in Yugoslavia.

Then, on Friday, the Italian Socialists, party of Premier Bettino Craxi, called for a shutdown of the Rome-area ***nuclear*** plant, one of three in the nation. It would be a "significant gesture," they said, at a time when activists were pushing for a nationwide referendum on the future of ***nuclear energy***.

Here is a region-by-region look at other after-effects of Chernobyl:

WESTERN EUROPE=

Demonstrators rallied in West Germany, the Netherlands and Spain to demand a shutdown of their countries' ***nuclear*** power installations.

In West Germany, which has 20 operating plants and is building or planning 13 others, the issue could help the environmentalist Greens party and the main opposition Social Democrats in national elections next January. The Social Democrats favor a gradual phase-out of ***nuclear*** power.

In Sweden, where voters in 1980 decided to shut down their four ***nuclear*** power plants by the year 2010, political analysts said Chernobyl could pressure the government into speeding up the process. The first showdown may come over a government plan to spend $160 million to improve one plant.

Swiss voters in 1979 narrowly rejected a proposal to rein in ***nuclear*** power, but environmentalists say they will now use the example of Chernobyl to collect 100,000 petition signatures needed for a new referendum. An opinion poll published last week indicated 45 percent of Swiss oppose ***nuclear*** power.

Belgian Premier Wilfred Martens, whose country depends on atomic power for 60 percent of its electricity, told Parliament on Friday he had ordered a strengthening of safety programs.

But in France, authorities said Chernobyl would have no impact on a ***nuclear*** program that produces 65 percent of the country's power, and few protests were evident.

EASTERN EUROPE=

Poland, with Soviet help, is building its first atomic power plant, at Zarnowiec on the Baltic coast. Program chief Mieczyslaw Sowinski said the Soviet disaster, which spread radioactivity across Poland, "should not have any impact" on the plans. But some Poles felt otherwise, including 200 who staged a protest in the southern city of Wroclaw behind banners reading, "Zarnowiec Will Be Next."

No street demonstrations were reported in tightly disciplined East Germany. But, in Chernobyl's aftermath, the Communist Party newspaper published an article in which scientists said extra safety precautions would be built into East Germany's five power reactors.

Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria also have ***nuclear*** power plants, but no public questioning of those systems was reported.

MIDDLE EAST=

Negotiations with France for Israel's first power reactor will go ahead despite the Soviet accident, Israeli officials said. But some legislators called for an inquiry into whether Israel needs ***nuclear energy*** at all.

In Egypt, which has no ***nuclear*** power plants but is planning to build eight reactors, an official source quoted in the government-owned press said those plans would be unaffected. Even before Chernobyl, however, President Hosni Mubarak was known to be uneasy over the safety and costliness of ***nuclear energy***.

FAR EAST=

The Soviet accident raised concerns in Taiwan, where a generator fire shut down one of three ***nuclear*** plants last November. Some legislators now want a thorough review of reactor safety, but government officials say they still plan to proceed with a fourth plant. Taiwan gets 59 percent of its power supplies from ***nuclear*** facilities.

Across the South China Sea, near densely populated Hong Kong, the Chinese Communist government is building a ***nuclear*** plant at Daya Bay. Hong Kong's British colonial government, to allay local concerns, hastily asked London's Atomic ***Energy*** Authority to draw up contingency plans for potential disasters.

The government in South Korea, which draws 18 percent of its electricity from ***nuclear*** plants, issued no statements in Chernobyl's aftermath. But the independent Korea Times newspaper said the accident "alerts Korean authorities to take all precautionary measures to ensure ***nuclear*** safety."

In Tokyo, officials said Japan would continue expanding its ***nuclear*** power system, which already includes 32 reactors. But one power company official acknowledged that at some point the Japanese, target of a U.S. ***nuclear*** attack in World War II, "are likely to respond emotionally against ***nuclear*** power."

WESTERN HEMISPHERE=

In Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, where ***nuclear***-power plans already were scaled back or in question because of financial problems, commentators suggested that the "Chernobyl factor" also be weighed.

"How well prepared will we be in Mexico to control one of these failures in the Laguna Verde plant?" asked Mexico City's El Sol newspaper, referring to Mexico's almost-operational first plant.

In Communist Cuba, where the Soviets are building four power reactors, the official news media touched only lightly on the dangers of Chernobyl, focusing instead on what it said was overdramatization of the accident by the Western media.
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Austria's only ***nuclear*** power station is to be dismantled, Chancellor Fred Sinowatz, said yesterday.

The decision ends years of uncertainty about the plant, at Zwentendorf, which was completed in 1978 but never used because a referendum in the same year decided against commissioning it.

Dr Sinowatz told Parliament: "The Government has accepted a report outlining the complete liquidation of the existing ***nuclear*** power plant at Zwentendorf … the problem of the use of ***nuclear energy*** in Austria can be considered as decided and closed."

Dismantling Zwentendorf was a necessary consequence of the Soviet accident at Chernobyl, he said.

Austria will also urge Bonn not to build a ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant at Wackersdorf in Bavaria. Earlier this week, the Government here said that the plant would "threaten the whole of Austria."

Despite the large scale use of hydro-power to generate electricity, as well as of coal and oil-fired plants, Austria faces regular shortages of electricity in winter, forcing it to import electricity.

The International ***Energy*** Agency has repeatedly warned Austria about its increasing dependence on ***energy*** imports from the East bloc. All natural gas imports and about a third of its oil come from the Soviet Union. Large quantities of other fuels and raw materials also come from Eastern Europe.
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Greens hit N-power HANOVER.\_ The radical Greens Party, their anti-***nuclear*** stand revived as a public issue by the Chernobyl disaster, opened a four-day congress yesterday with a call for a civil disobedience campaign to force the government to renounce the atom as an ***energy*** source.

QNP

Jutta Ditfurth, a Greens parliamentarian in Bonn, said the fear aroused among West Germans by the Soviet ***nuclear*** accident must be transformed into resistance.

She said the party's message should be: ""Practise civil disobedience \_ defend yourselves."

Ditfurth added that resistance, which she did not define, must be so strong that the majority opinion allegedly favoring the immediate shutdown of ***nuclear energy*** plants would become ""a stable political factor".

Lukas Beckmann, spokesman for the parliamentary party, warned the country's main opposition party, the Social Democrats (SPD), that they would lose the support of the Greens unless they decided quickly to abandon ***nuclear*** power.

He said this included the state government in Hesse, ruled by an SPD-Greens coalition, where SPD state premier Holger Boerner refused earlier Greens demands for a shutdown of ***nuclear*** power stations in the state.

Beckmann said if the SPD did not toe the ***nuclear*** line, the Greens would withdraw from the coalition.

Reuter
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A House panel has approved a ***nuclear*** accident insurance bill that has the ***nuclear*** industry, its opponents and even some panel members hoping for a better deal in another committee or on the floor.

The compromise bill worked out by members of the House Interior Committee, approved Wednesday on a voice vote, was condemned by lobbyists and committee members alike.

"If it goes to the president's desk like it is, we'd urge a veto," said George E. White Jr., vice president of Middle South Services Inc., a New Orleans-based utility holding company.

"I don't think anyone's happy with this compromise. Certainly I'm not," said Rep. John Seiberling, D-Ohio. "But in the interests of resolving the issue, this is the best course we can work out."The bill, an extension of the 30-year-old Price-Anderson Act, raises the ceiling on ***nuclear*** accident insurance from $650 million to $6.5 billion \_ higher than the $2 billion proposed by industry lobbyists, but lower than the $8 billion sought by some committee members, including chairman Morris Udall, D-Ariz.

Some lobbyists raised the specter of the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant accident and said even $8 billion was too low. Others, on the industry side, warned of killing ***nuclear energy*** unless a lower level prevailed.

"Nobody voted for us," said Kevin Billings, a lobbyist for the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council. He said the compromise is better than unlimited liability or the Udall plan, but added: "Clearly it's going to discourage utilities from ordering any new reactors."Under the Interior bill, utilities would have to privately insure each of their reactors for $200 million, up from the current $160 million.

If an accident occurred and claims exceeded $200 million, utilities would be assessed up to $10 million a year per reactor for a maximum of $63 million \_ an industry-wide total of $6.3 billion assuming 100 reactors are in operation. Currently, utilities can only be assessed a one-shot payment of up to $5 million per reactor to cover accident claims.

Other parts of the compromise reached Wednesday eliminated an indexing provision that pegged the ceiling to inflation, and another provision allowing utilities to sue manufacturers whose negligence caused an accident.

"General Electric and Westinghouse can be grossly negligent under this bill and not have to pay a dime. That's outrageous,"said Keiki Kehoe, director of the ***Nuclear*** Accountability and Insurance Project at the Environmental Policy Institute.

Committee members and the industry said allowing such lawsuits would undercut the Price-Anderson principle of no-fault risk-sharing by the industry as a whole.

Kathleen Welch, a consumer lobbyist with the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, said there were enough votes to retain an $8 billion liability ceiling approved 21-20 last month.

Few committee members expressed a commitment to keep the bill intact, and several announced their intentions to try to change it.

"All I'm pledged to at this point is an open rule," said Udall, referring to a floor procedure that allows unlimited amendments. He said he would be strongly inclined to support restoration of the indexing provision on the floor.

The bill is expected to go to the House ***Energy*** and Commerce Committee before it reaches the floor, and two other committees with marginal jurisdiction may also request a chance to consider the measure.

The Senate ***Energy*** and Natural Resources Committee last month approved a $2.2 billion liability limit and sent its bill to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.
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Swedish ***Energy*** Minister Brigitta Dahl plans to submit a bill to Parliament to prohibit planning, design, and construction of any additional ***nuclear*** reactors in Sweden. Dahl, interviewed late last month on a popular radio news program, attacked the country's ***nuclear*** utilities and industry for attempting to sway public opinion toward revising the 1980 parliamentary decision barring construction of more than 12 ***nuclear*** power plants in Sweden. "It is time to expose the profit interest behind the campaign for additional reactors," Dahl declared.

Dahl's ire was directed towards a study project, known as "pre-project 04," being conducted by OKG, AB, the owner of the Oskarshamn ***nuclear*** station. She interpreted the project as planning for a fourth reactor at Oskarshamn. Oskarshamn-3 is the final Swedish reactor under current law. Lennart Fogelstroem, managing director of OKG, said the 04 project involves a maximum of three full-time employees collecting information about the operation of existing reactors, in order to retain highest technical competence during the next 25 years, the planned lifetime of the existing plants. Under current law, all 12 reactors would be phased out by the year 2010.

Dahl said her planned legislation would put a stop to planning or design of new reactors in Sweden, although she did not give details of the bill's wording. It would, presumably, have to exempt work on reactors for foreign applications. Asea-Atom hopes to bid on future reactors in Finland, where two 660-MW Asea BWRs are operating already, and is working on the PIUS and SECURE "inherently safe" reactors that have received attention in the U.S. Dahl this month assumed the additional cabinet portfolio of environment minister. It was previously held by Ingvar Carlsson, named Prime Minister following the assassination of Olof Palme.

Meanwhile, some members of the governing Social-Democratic Party are starting to break ranks on the ***nuclear*** issue. Bengt Christersson, a Social Democrat city councillor from Oskarshamn, sharply attacked a brochure published by the Ministry of ***Energy*** that discusses the government's "strategy for ***nuclear*** phase-out," published in connection with Dahl's announcement of the phase-out strategy (NW, 5 Dec. '85, 11). Christersson, in an OKG publication, said the brochure presents "a vision of a future ***energy*** society that has no foundation in reality. . . . Is it me or the ***energy*** minister who has bad advisors?" He said it is time to include ***nuclear energy*** in Sweden's long-term ***energy*** strategy.

Christersson's statements follow a similarly heretical move earlier this year by Birger Rosqvist, a Social Democratic Parliament member from Oskarshamn, and four party colleagues, who submitted a motion in Parliament calling for unbiased, objective, and well-rounded information by the government on ***nuclear*** power (NW, 13 Feb., 14). The motion, criticized by antinuclear forces, attracted considerable attention beause it demonstrated some Social Democrats are willing to break the tradition of strict party discipline to speak on the ***nuclear*** power issue.

Dahl's proposed legislation was also bitterly attacked by Goesta Agrenius, a long-time ***nuclear*** advocate and former managing director of Kraangede AB, a utility with shares in ***nuclear*** stations. In a commentary in the Stockhom daily Svenska Dagbladet, Argenius fumed: "What's the next step -- prohibiting speaking and writing positively about ***nuclear*** power? . . . Perhaps it will be a criminal offense to have literature that discusses ***nuclear energy*** in a factual way." He asked, "Is . . . the government afraid that it might, for political reasons, be forced to refuse a license for a new ***nuclear*** reactor, and thus have to bear full responsibility when Sweden's electric power supply breaks down in several years?"

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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Hundreds of thousands of cheering, joyous Soviet citizens paraded

through the city in May Day festivities yesterday, carrying banners

celebrating the achievements of Soviet labor in almost all spheres except

that of ***nuclear energy***.

Official slogans to be promoted on May Day are approved and published

in advance, and the country's major plans for ***nuclear*** power expansion were

initially among them. But, after the ***nuclear*** accident at Chernobyl, the

theme was absent yesterday.

A big placard read "No to ***nuclear*** madness,'' but it was a reference to

U.S. plans for ***nuclear*** weapons in outer space. The Soviets announced plans

at their recent party congress to greatly expand their reliance on ***nuclear***

***energy*** to compensate for lower yields from oil and gas extraction.

The May Day parade, a day of workers' solidarity and one of the biggest

events on the Soviet calendar, was held under cool spring sunshine. Shouts

of "hurrah, hurrah," emanated from Red Square, where Soviet leaders took

their place atop the Lenin mausoleum to wave to the throngs.

There were no signs that the parade spirit was dampened by the ***nuclear***

tragedy, which has not made big news in Moscow. The day was the beginning

of a four-day weekend celebration, and those who were parading were likely

to head for their country dachas, leaving the Westerners in the city to

worry about the ***nuclear*** incident.

The city was immaculate. There were no cars on the central streets, the

trees were blossoming and the sprawling Moscow buildings were festooned in

red banners with gigantic portraits of Lenin, Marx, Engels and other

heroes of the proletariat.

As the parade moved along Leninski Prospect to Red Square, four street-

washing vehicles followed, minutely cleansing the pavement on which the

marchers walked.

The featured slogans of the day were "progress in science and

technology is the call of time,'' "forward by the Leninist course of the

27th party congress along the lines of Communist creation and peace,'' and

"we shall prevent the militarization of outer space.''

Raisa Gorbachev, the wife of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, told

reporters that "it's a wonderful holiday,'' and said, when asked, that Mr.

Gorbachev is looking forward to visiting the United States at some point.

Mr. Gorbachev, who did not speak at the event, was a picture of

contentment atop the mausoleum, waving cheerfully and chatting at length

with Politburo mates, all of whom were wearing top hats. Anatole Dobrynin,

the former long-time Soviet ambassador to Washington, had a place on the

mausoleum, suggesting that he enjoys considerable power in his new post as

a foreign policy maker.

The celebrations were attended by delegations of the trade union

movement from more than 100 countries. The words "peace'' and "work'' were

on banners everywhere. In past parades, huge portraits of Politburo

members were paraded around the square. But Mr. Gorbachev has de-

emphasized the glorification of the leadership since coming to office in

March of last year, and the portraits were not in evidence yesterday.

The Soviet newspapers were adorned in red, and editorials proclaimed

the glories of communism. "On a major part of the planet,'' said Pravda,

"hundreds of millions of people are confidently building a society without

exploitation and wars. Ever more, new countries and people are breaking

the chains of oppression and gain a possibility to shape their historical

destiny themselves. The forces of imperalist reaction and aggression are

encountering an ever mightier rebuff.''

**Graphic**

Illustration
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MELBOURNE - The Soviet ***nuclear*** accident would "have taken many lives immediately", three major Australian anti-***nuclear*** groups claimed yesterday.

The Movement Against Uranium Mining, People for ***Nuclear*** Disarmament and Friends of the Earth said in a joint statement that the accident near Kiev was probably a core meltdown.

aap

It "would have taken many lives immediately, critically polluted major parts of the Soviet Union, and will cause illness, genetic malformations and death to millions in the Scandinavian countries and the USSR in centuries to come," the statement said.

"This accident further illustrates the danger that ***nuclear energy*** will also destroy the air, water and food supplies necessary for life on this planet by the operations and accidents connected with the ***nuclear*** power and ***nuclear*** weapons industries.

"Further disasters of this kind are inevitable if ***nuclear*** power continues to be used."

The Federal Government "must place strong pressure on the Soviet Union to reveal the causes and consequences of this accident," it said.

The groups also called on the Government to close Australian uranium mines and the Lucas Heights reactor, ban visits by ***nuclear*** ships and move to extend the South Pacific ***nuclear*** free zone concept to include the banning of ***nuclear*** powered reactors.
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Lawmakers are looking for ways to ensure that Cuban ***nuclear*** reactors constructed by the Soviets are not susceptible to accidents similar to the Chernobyl catastrophe.

A State Department official and a private ***nuclear*** power expert said Thursday that, because of newer technology, two Cuban reactors the Soviets are helping to build appear to be safer than the damaged Chernobyl station in the Ukraine.

But in a letter delivered to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, Sen. Paula Hawkins, R-Fla., called on the Soviets to halt the project, which is under construction in the south coast city of Cienfuegos, about 200 miles from the Florida coast.

"I urge the Soviet government to acknowledge its responsibility to the rest of the international community for the safety of ***nuclear*** power facilities and halt the construction of the facility in Cuba," Mrs. Hawkins wrote.

Rep. Dante Fascell, D-Fla., chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said Tuesday he had asked the State Department and the Organization of American States to verify with Cuban authorities that adequate safeguards are in place.

"Unless this is done, the plant could pose a threat not only to the United States, particularly to Florida, but to the Caribbean and Central America as well and equally to the citizens of Cuba themselves," Fascell said.

Fascell's office said no response had been received from the State Department or the OAS as of Thursday.

But Marcello Alonzo, a Cuban-born ***nuclear*** physicist who once served on the Inter-American ***Nuclear Energy*** Commission, said the Cuban reactors are being constructed with pressurized water reactors. Unlike the Chernobyl reactor, they do not have graphite cores.

"There cannot be a similar accident because the reactors, while both designed by the Soviets, are so different. An accident of the type that occurred in the Soviet Union is impossible because there is no graphite to ignite," he said. He also noted the Cuban reactors will have containment shells.

Roland Draxler, meteorologist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said that in the event of a serious ***nuclear*** accident in Cuba, a southerly wind could carry radioactive particles over the American mainland.

He said southerly winds in the Caribbean are particularly common in the late summer and early fall, which is the hurricane season in that region.

A 1985 article in the Cuban magazine "Cuba Socialista" said the reactors are being built to withstand the "improbable circumstance" of a hurricane, earthquake or airplane crash.

The Cuban diplomatic mission in Washington was closed Thursday for the May Day holiday, but a mission spokesman, Angel Pino, was quoted in published reports earlier this week as saying: "The project is progressing well. There is no reason for worry or concern."

President Fidel Castro, whose son, Fidelito, is executive secretary of the ***Nuclear Energy*** Commission of Cuba, has repeatedly stressed that the containment structures will ensure the safety of the Cuban people in the event of an accident.

In addition to the two reactors in Cienfuegos, additional reactors are planned for eastern and western Cuba as part of a long-range plan to minimize Cuban dependence on oil.

"Our ***energy*** must be based on ***nuclear*** plants," Castro has said. Two years ago, Castro said there were 188 Soviet advisers at work on the project, but last month a Soviet technician interviewed on Cuban television said the Soviet team there numbered 300.

A State Department official, who asked not to be identified, also said newer technology is being used at the Cienfuegos project, which will be fueled with slightly enriched uranium provided by the Soviets.
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The International Atomic ***Energy*** Authority, in Vienna, has reacted cautioisly to the news of the accident at the ***nuclear*** power plant in Chernboyl. It has been officially informed by the Soviet Government of the incident, although no help has been requested.

The Soviet message was apparently quite short and did not go into detail.

A spokesman for the IAEA said that the plant was one of the 28 light water-cooled graphite reactors - known as RMBKs - which together produce 15,616 megawatts, over half the Soviet annual ***nuclear*** power output. Until the incident at Chernobyl, they were thought to have an excellent safety record.

The IAEA has 112 members. It does not monitor or exercise any power over its members, being there merely to coordinate and offer advice on the exclusively peaceful development of ***nuclear energy*** around the world.

In Paris the International ***Energy*** Agency director, Helga Steeg, said yesterday that industrialised nations must carry on generating ***nuclear*** power in order to safeguard their independence in ***energy*** production. The 21-nation agency coordinates ***energy*** policy to try to ensure supplies.

She said that the IEA members 'cannot forgo the possbility of ***nuclear*** power generation. ' Otherwise the would slip back into dependence on oil supplies from Opec.

She added that the governments of Western industrialised countries worked closely together on ***nuclear*** safety standards. 'Operating safety is no problem here,' she said.
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Ontario Hydro says ***nuclear*** power is the most economical and reliable source of electricity, but has asked the province whether it is willing to spend more money to find alternative sources of power.

Testifying before the Legislature's select committee on ***energy***, Hydro officials yesterday explored all the power supply options available, aside from building new generating stations powered by coal or ***nuclear energy***.

Hydro asked the MPPs to consider how much extra money might be available to develop a new hydraulic power plant, to purchase power from Manitoba or Quebec, or to develop small alternative technologies such as wind, wood or solar power.

The submissions ended two full days of presentations by the utility, featuring slide shows, a movie and several volumes of material prepared by Hydro researchers.

Hydro has told the committee that it is studying power requirements for the late 1990s and beyond, under the assumption that the $11 billion Darlington ***nuclear*** station near Oshawa will be completed early in the next decade.

The utility has agreed to look at alternative sources of electricity in the future and to try to reduce demand for power through conservation methods.

The all-party committee's purpose is to decide whether Darlington should, in fact, be completed at all.

**Load-Date:** May 13, 1999

**End of Document**



[***news analysis: chernobyl accident casts shadow over soviet nuclear industry***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3SJB-1TN0-000W-B104-00000-00&context=1516831)

The Xinhua General Overseas News ServiceXinhua General News Service

MAY 13, 1986, TUESDAY

**Length:** 637 words

**Byline:** by wang xianju

**Dateline:** beijing, may 13; ITEM NO: 0513110

**Body**

the accident at the soviet union's chernobyl ***nuclear*** power station, believed to be one of the world's most serious ***nuclear*** disasters in three decades, has seriously cut soviet ***energy*** production and is also expected to slow down the development of its ***nuclear*** industry. construction of the chernobyl station, 130 kilometers north of the ukrainian capital of kiev, began in 1972. its four graphite-moderated reactors were completed in 1977, 1979, 1982 and 1983, acheiving a generating capacity of 4,000 megawatts by the end of 1985. according to soviet reports, the chernobyl accident began with a chemical explosion in the early morning of april 26, which triggered a massive fire and damaged one of the four reactors at the station. the other three reactors were immeadiately shut down as a safety precaution. the electricity generated by the chernobyl station accounted for about half of the power produced in the ukraine, which is now relying on neighboring republics to cover its power shortage after the accident. foreign experts estimate that the shutdown of the crippled chernobyl station is costing the soviet union about four million u.s. dollars a day. unconfirmed western reports say the soviets have closed all the nation's 15 graphite-moderated reactors in the wake of the chernobyl mishap. if these reports are true, losses to the country would be much greater than the four-million-dollar figure. the ***nuclear*** industry has grown rapidly in the soviet union since it built the world's first experimental, 5,000-kilowatt ***nuclear*** reactor in obninsk, southwest of moscow, in june 1954. the country had 41 ***nuclear*** power-generating units in operation with a total capacity of 25,000 megawatts by the end of 1985. they produced about 155 billion kilowatt-hours last year, accounting for one-tenth of the country's total electricity output, and the soviet union was the world's third largest atomic ***energy*** producer last year after the united states and france.it has plans to double its ***nuclear energy*** output by 1990 and triple it by the year 2000, which means that ***nuclear***-generated electricity will make up 20 percent of the country's total power output in 1990. this ambitious plan has been setback by the chernobyl accident, which experts say will at least slow down the progress of the soviet ***nuclear*** industry for several years. two new graphite-moderated reactors were under construction at chernobyle at the time of the accident.their completion will raise the station's generating capacity to 6,000 megawatts, a one third increase over its present level. now the plan has to be reviewed. the soviet government newspaper izvestia reported that construction of the fifth reactor at the station has stopped "for understandable reasons." most of the existing graphite-moderated reactors in the soviet union, for reasons of economy, have no containment buildings which can prevent radioactive substances from spreading in case of accidents. the chernobyl disaster will force the soviets to reconsider the need of building containment structures for reactors, and they will also have to improve the emergency core cooling systems at ***nuclear*** power stations. while upgrading its graphite-moderated reactors, the country will probably give greater attention to the more advanced light-water reactors. all this demands an increase of investment in the ***nuclear*** industry and better ***nuclear*** technology, which means an additional burden on the country's sluggish economy and changes in the kremlin's ***nuclear energy*** development plan. however, one must not think that the chernobyl disaster will make the soviet leadership abandon their ***nuclear*** power program, which is a major part of moscow's long-term strategy to meet the rising domestic demands for ***energy*** and match the west in ***nuclear*** technology.
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The Chernobyl catastrophe in the Soviet Union, which may be the worst ***nuclear energy*** accident in history, is producing a new dose of political fallout for a U.S. atomic program already reeling from cost overruns, plant cancellations, safety concerns and fears about radioactive wastes.

Stocks of American utilities with heavy investments in atomic power plants plummeted Tuesday as news about the severity of the accident at the four-reactor Chernobyl plant 60 miles north of Kiev began filtering to the United States.

***Nuclear*** industry officials braced themselves for a repeat of the political and public furor that stalled the U.S. program for two full years immediately after the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island plant in Pennsylvania.

However, citing the more stringent government regulation of ***nuclear*** power here than in the Soviet Union, particularly since the TMI accident, officials and ***energy*** experts said the long-term effect of the Chernobyl accident on the U.S. atomic activities will be minimal.

"Those who want to discredit ***nuclear energy*** will use this to do that," said Elihu Bergman, executive director of Americans for ***Energy*** Independence, a coalition of industry and academic experts. "The real issue is the effect that declining oil prices will have on utility plans for new power plants."

Charles K. Ebinger, director of ***energy*** and strategic resources studies at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic Studies, called the disaster "just the type of thing ***nuclear*** opponents have been looking for."

Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho, said he feared "many people would try to draw parallels between this accident and the U.S. experience." But, he added, "We have nothing in this country that is identical to the Soviet plants."

An ad-hoc coalition of several anti-***nuclear*** and environmental groups \_ including the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Sierra Club and the National Audubon Society \_ cited the Soviet accident on Tuesday in calling for shutting down the U.S. atomic program.

"As long as there are operating ***nuclear*** power plants in the United States, we live with the risk of a similar accident here," the coalition said in a statement.

However, industry and government officials said the same kind of accident is virtually impossible at a civilian power plant here, primarily because all U.S. plants are enclosed in four-foot-thick concrete and steel containments.

According to the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, no nation other than the Soviet Union operates civilian power plant reactors without containments to prevent radiation from escaping into the atmosphere if other safety systems fail.

In addition, ever since a 1974 fire at the Browns Ferry ***nuclear*** plant in Alabama, government regulators have required U.S. reactors to have expensive automatic sprinkler systems for extinguishing fires similar to the one at Chernobyl.

U.S. reactors, as opposed to those in the Soviet Union, have a "defense-in-depth" concept, said James Vaughan, acting assistant ***energy*** secretary for ***nuclear*** power programs.

"People who live around power plants in this country are not subjected to the kind of risks that this type of accident represents," said Paul Turner, vice president of the Atomic Industrial Forum, an industry group.

Ed Davis, president of the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council, the industry's lobbying arm, said the Soviet accident "doesn't help us, but I'm optimistic we'll weather the storm."

"It's clear that the Soviets have taken some shortcuts and I think the public will recognize the contrasts between the two systems," Davis said. "Utilities were not planning to order any new reactors for at least three to five years anyway."

With 101 civilian power reactors holding ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission operating licenses, atomic power now provides about one-sixth of the United States' electricity. That is expected to grow to 19 percent by 1995 as most of the 27 plants still under construction are completed, according to ***Energy*** Department projections.

However, no new plants have been ordered since 1978. And utilities have canceled more than 100 reactors, largely because the growth in electricity demand has not met the historic annual 7 percent increases that had been anticipated into the future when the plants were ordered in the 1970s.

Plants completed in recent years have been plagued by expensive safety "backfits" ordered in the wake of Three Mile Island, double-digit interest rates and prolonged construction periods.

William Lee, chairman of Duke Power Co., one of the nation's largest ***nuclear*** utilities, told congressional committees last year that no utility will order another reactor until some of the regulatory and financial paths for them are cleared.

Congress, the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission and the Reagan administration have been working in recent years to remove some of the barriers to a ***nuclear*** revival.

Legislation extending no-fault ***nuclear*** accident insurance to future plants but raising the liability ceiling from its current $620 million level to $2 billion to $8 billion was passed by a House committee last week and a Senate committee earlier this year.

The ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission has taken several steps and the Reagan administration is sponsoring bills to pre-approve "standardized" designs for future plants.

Industry and Wall Street officials said the Soviet accident may set those efforts back temporarily.

"One thing members of Congress do not like to do is legislate in the absence of facts so I think they're going to be inclined to put things on hold for awhile," said Davis.

While the stock prices of electric utilities with large investments in ***nuclear*** plants dropped Tuesday, largely in reaction to the Soviet accident, financial analysts said they expect them to rebound.

Fulton S. Holmes, a utility analyst at New York's Thomson McKinnon Securities, said each unfinished plant costs the sponsoring companies $30 million a day, and investors fear delays over safety concerns caused by the Soviet accident will aggravate the loss.

"I think this reaction is the nervous nellies, not the people who know what's going on in the industry," said Joseph B. Muldoon, a utility securities analyst at Janney Montgomery Scott Inc., a Philadelphia investment firm.
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The Chernobyl catastrophe in the Soviet Union, which may be the worst ***nuclear energy*** accident in history, is producing a new dose of political fallout for a U.S. atomic program already reeling from cost overruns, plant cancellations, safety concerns and fears about radioactive wastes.

Stocks of American utilities with heavy investments in atomic power plants plummeted Tuesday as news about the severity of the accident at the four-reactor Chernobyl plant 60 miles north of Kiev began filtering to the United States.

***Nuclear*** industry officials braced themselves for a repeat of the political and public furor that stalled the U.S. program for two full years immediately after the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island plant in Pennsylvania.

However, citing the more stringent government regulation of ***nuclear*** power here than in the Soviet Union, particularly since the TMI accident, officials and ***energy*** experts said the long-term effect of the Chernobyl accident on the U.S. atomic activities will be minimal.

"Those who want to discredit ***nuclear energy*** will use this to do that," said Elihu Bergman, executive director of Americans for ***Energy*** Independence, a coalition of industry and academic experts. "The real issue is the effect that declining oil prices will have on utility plans for new power plants."

Charles K. Ebinger, director of ***energy*** and strategic resources studies at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic Studies, called the disaster "just the type of thing ***nuclear*** opponents have been looking for."

Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho, said he feared "many people would try to draw parallels between this accident and the U.S. experience." But, he added, "We have nothing in this country that is identical to the Soviet plants."

An ad-hoc coalition of several anti-***nuclear*** and environmental groups \_ including the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Sierra Club and the National Audubon Society \_ cited the Soviet accident on Tuesday in calling for shutting down the U.S. atomic program.

"As long as there are operating ***nuclear*** power plants in the United States, we live with the risk of a similar accident here," the coalition said in a statement.

However, industry and government officials said the same kind of accident is virtually impossible at a civilian power plant here, primarily because all U.S. plants are enclosed in four-foot-thick concrete and steel containments.

According to the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, no nation other than the Soviet Union operates civilian power plant reactors without containments to prevent radiation from escaping into the atmosphere if other safety systems fail.

In addition, ever since a 1974 fire at the Browns Ferry ***nuclear*** plant in Alabama, government regulators have required U.S. reactors to have expensive automatic sprinkler systems for extinguishing fires similar to the one at Chernobyl.

U.S. reactors, as opposed to those in the Soviet Union, have a "defense-in-depth" concept, said James Vaughan, acting assistant ***energy*** secretary for ***nuclear*** power programs.

"People who live around power plants in this country are not subjected to the kind of risks that this type of accident represents," said Paul Turner, vice president of the Atomic Industrial Forum, an industry group.

Ed Davis, president of the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council, the industry's lobbying arm, said the Soviet accident "doesn't help us, but I'm optimistic we'll weather the storm."

"It's clear that the Soviets have taken some shortcuts and I think the public will recognize the contrasts between the two systems," Davis said. "Utilities were not planning to order any new reactors for at least three to five years anyway."

With 101 civilian power reactors holding ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission operating licenses, atomic power now provides about one-sixth of the United States' electricity. That is expected to grow to 19 percent by 1995 as most of the 27 plants still under construction are completed, according to ***Energy*** Department projections.

However, no new plants have been ordered since 1978. And utilities have canceled more than 100 reactors, largely because the growth in electricity demand has not met the historic annual 7 percent increases that had been anticipated into the future when the plants were ordered in the 1970s.

Plants completed in recent years have been plagued by expensive safety "backfits" ordered in the wake of Three Mile Island, double-digit interest rates and prolonged construction periods.

William Lee, chairman of Duke Power Co., one of the nation's largest ***nuclear*** utilities, told congressional committees last year that no utility will order another reactor until some of the regulatory and financial paths for them are cleared.

Congress, the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission and the Reagan administration have been working in recent years to remove some of the barriers to a ***nuclear*** revival.

Legislation extending no-fault ***nuclear*** accident insurance to future plants but raising the liability ceiling from its current $620 million level to $2 billion to $8 billion was passed by a House committee last week and a Senate committee earlier this year.

The ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission has taken several steps and the Reagan administration is sponsoring bills to pre-approve "standardized" designs for future plants.

Industry and Wall Street officials said the Soviet accident may set those efforts back temporarily.

"One thing members of Congress do not like to do is legislate in the absence of facts so I think they're going to be inclined to put things on hold for awhile," said Davis.

While the stock prices of electric utilities with large investments in ***nuclear*** plants dropped Tuesday, largely in reaction to the Soviet accident, financial analysts said they expect them to rebound.

Fulton S. Holmes, a utility analyst at New York's Thomson McKinnon Securities, said each unfinished plant costs the sponsoring companies $30 million a day, and investors fear delays over safety concerns caused by the Soviet accident will aggravate the loss.

"I think this reaction is the nervous nellies, not the people who know what's going on in the industry," said Joseph B. Muldoon, a utility securities analyst at Janney Montgomery Scott Inc., a Philadelphia investment firm.
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Anti-***nuclear*** demonstrators won a meeting with the Minister for Environment and Planning, Dr Hopgood, after a demonstration outside the State Administration Centre yesterday.

The lunchtime rally attracted about 80 protesters concerned about the ***nuclear*** disaster at Chernobyl, in the Soviet Union, and SA's role in the ***nuclear*** fuel cycle.

The demonstrators originally had hoped to meet the Premier, Mr Bannon, to lobby the Government against the mining of uranium as part of the Roxby Downs project.

Reporters were not allowed to attend Dr Hopgood's meeting with representatives of the Campaign Against ***Nuclear Energy*** and the Friends of the Earth.

However, FOE spokeswoman Ms Ally Fricker said both anti-***nuclear*** groups wanted to know the Government's attitude to the Chernobyl disaster.

"Dr Hopgood said Cabinet had not discussed the disaster or any of the implications surrounding it," she said.

"However, he did say SA did not want any ***nuclear*** testing here or any ***nuclear*** reactors.

"To the anti-***nuclear*** movement this notion seems absurb because the State Government is quite obviously happy to provide fuel for an industry they don't want any part of."

A spokesman for Dr Hopgood said last night Dr Hopgood had listened to the group's views and would be putting them to the Cabinet.
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Fidel Castro is staking Cuba's ***energy*** future to ***nuclear*** reactors designed by Soviet specialists, and experts said Tuesday the Soviet disaster is likely to raise concerns about the project less than 200 miles from Florida.

"If there were an accident of major variety (in Cuba), we would be in bad shape around here," said Baehram Kursunoglu, who heads the University of Miami's Center for Theoretical Research.

Castro has emphasized the safety features of the four reactors under construction near the southern city of Cienfuegos. Dave Joliffe, a spokesman for the American ***Nuclear*** Society, said available information indicates that retaining walls are being built around the reactors and that pressurized water will be used to moderate chain reactions.

Water is used in U.S. plants, while the Chernobyl plant in the Soviet Union used graphite and apparently had no protective containing walls such as those that surround U.S. plants.

Kursunoglu, a Turkish-born physicist, has been invited to a forum planning committee in Moscow in September to set an agenda for a 1987 forum of 20 international experts on ***nuclear energy***. He said a major priority of such groups now will be improving ***nuclear*** safety.

He added that he will call for international inspections of all ***nuclear*** power plants.

"I'm sure the people in Florida are going to be upset (about the Cuban project), but I'm not sure there's much they can do about it," said Bob Jefferson, a New Mexico-based consultant on ***nuclear energy***.

Jefferson, who said current Soviet ***nuclear*** designs are much safer than those used in the Chernobyl reactors, said East Bloc countries have allowed some international inspections but for the most part haven't been as cooperative as Western ***nuclear*** nations.

Designed by Soviet specialists and being built by Cuban and Bulgarian workers, the reactors in Cuba are to begin operations in 1989.

Last month, a Cuban television interview with Vladimir Roche, identified as the head of the 300 Soviet specialists working on the project, said the reactor construction was on schedule. Roche said the Soviets involved had extensive experience in building ***nuclear*** power plants at home.

U.S. interest in the project since it was announced in 1980 has centered around the possibility of a military use, but the State Department has said there is no evidence that the reactors could be used to produce weapons.

"In the future, our development must be fundamentally ***nuclear***," Castro said in a speech 1 1/2 years ago. "Our ***energy*** must be based on ***nuclear*** plants."

He said the four new reactors each will save Cuba the cost of importing 600,000 barrels of oil annually.

While praising the economic benefits of ***nuclear*** reactors, Castro and the state-run news media have stressed their safety.

In a July 26, 1984, speech at Cienfuegos celebrating his revolution's anniversary, Castro said thick concrete retaining walls would prevent any danger to the population and keep the reactors safe from crashing airplanes, hurricanes or earthquakes.

A pro-***nuclear*** campaign in the media preceded the December 1984 showing on Cuban television of "Silkwood," the American movie based on the story of Karen Silkwood, a worker exposed to radiation at a ***nuclear***-fuel producing plant. She died in a mysterious auto accident as she was working to expose alleged safety violations at the U.S. plant.

A Dec. 19, 1984, editorial in the Communist Party organ "Granma" said the public, before viewing the movie, should be aware that its "anti-scientific content" should be "related to North American reality."

"What we see in 'Silkwood' is that the deficiencies are not inherent in the technology but in class interests (not found) in the socialist system," Granma said.

Cuba-watchers speculate that the government decided to broadcast the movie because videocassettes of the movie were being shown in Cuban homes.
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Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers said his Government was pressing for

information on the meltdown at Chernobyl in the Ukraine and until its

inquiries were complete the plan to build up to four new ***nuclear*** power

stations would be put on hold.

His decision, announced after a Cabinet meeting, followed publication

of opinion polls that showed support for the ruling coalition falling and

opposition to ***nuclear*** power growing. A general election is to be held on

May 21.

Asked if the delay would be long, he said: ''I do not think it will

take two or three years, but I would say quite a few months.''

The Chernobyl accident, and the radiation it spewed over the

Netherlands, shocked the public. A Government information centre received

30,000 telephone calls in one week from people concerned about the dangers

of radiation.

In West Germany, the opposition Social Democrats thrust ***nuclear*** power

to centre stage yesterday for regional elections next month. As the

centre-right Cabinet met to discuss the April 26 Soviet accident, the

Social Democrat candidate for the Lower Saxony elections, Gerhard

Schroeder, said he would treat the poll as ''a people's referendum on

***nuclear energy***.''

Political analysts said renewed public concern over ***nuclear*** safety was

likely to give the SPD and the anti-***nuclear*** Greens vital additional votes

and to work against the staunchly pro-***nuclear*** Christian Democrats.
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The past few years have seen the publication of two reports directed to the same basic question: What is the future of ***nuclear*** electric power in the United States? One report, by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, is titled, "***Nuclear*** Power in an Age of Uncertainty" (OTA Report); the other, by Alvin Weinberg and associates at the Institute for ***Energy*** Analysis at Oak Ridge, is titled, "The Second ***Nuclear*** Era" (Weinberg Report).

The OTA Report analyzes a number of insititutional problems that confront the increased deployment of ***nuclear*** generating stations in the United States and reaches the conclusion that:

. . . there is no simple key to restoring ***nuclear*** power as a national ***energy*** option . . . .

The problems and uncertainties are great but not insurmountable. If the technology and its management improve sufficiently that confidence in both safety and economics is much higher, if ***nuclear*** regulation shows a parallel improvement, and if financial risks are shown to be less than financial rewards, then ***nuclear*** power would be a logical part of our ***energy*** future . . . .

The outlook for the ***nuclear*** supply industry is bleak but not hopeless.

The conclusions of Weinberg and colleagues have a much narrower focus. They seem to have found the simple key that eludes the OTA: The United States should develop a new power reactor design that is inherently safe and transparently so. The thrust of the argument is that while the present generation of light-water reactors (LWRs) appears sufficiently safe to the authors as technologists, their perspective is not shared by the public. To find ***nuclear*** power acceptable, the public needs to be reassured by the development of an inherently safe reactor.

In both reports, the onus to improve is placed primarily on the ***nuclear*** industry. S. David Freeman, a member of the Advisory Committee of the Second ***Nuclear*** Era Project, put it this way:

The future of ***nuclear*** may very well rest on the manner in which this excellent report is received, especially by the proponents of ***nuclear*** power. The R&D necessary to perfect these options is a federal responsibility, but the federal government cannot be expected to fund it if the ***nuclear*** industry does not realize that development of these concepts is a life and death matter for them as well as useful for the nation.

When Freeman says that the issue is one of life and death for the ***nuclear*** industry and also one of some loss of usefulness to the nation, he has things backwards. The life of the ***nuclear*** industry may or may not be at stake, but that issue ranks a distant second to the national welfare. Industries have been passing away since the dawn of the industrial revolution. The death of the U.S. mining industry was recently announced by a national magazine. So when the OTA states that the outlook for the U.S. ***nuclear*** supply industry is bleak, there is no arguing with the statement, but it misdirects attention to a secondary problem.

This article is written from the point of view that ***nuclear energy*** is indeed a substantive national problem. I believe that the generation of baseload electricity by means of the ***nuclear*** fission process is considerably safer than any comparable means; that it can be lower in cost, as it is in much of the world; that the United States, in its handling of ***nuclear*** electricity generation, is incurring large losses, which will continue and increase for the foreseeable future. Such a position is by no means beyond challenge, but its defense is not the subject here. In any case, the tale of ***nuclear energy*** in the United States will make one of the more curious chapters in the history of technology. It would be unfortunate if some of the points and omissions of the OTA and Weinberg Reports were to go unquestioned.

Of radiation and witches

The responsibility for our ***nuclear*** dilemma is much more broadly shared in our society than is admitted to by either of the two reports. Neither, for example, acknowledges that a phobia of things ***nuclear*** is so much a part of the American psyche that it is not possible for the country, as a society, to deal rationally with the problems of ***nuclear energy***. For many Americans, the fear of ***nuclear*** radiation can be objectively compared to the fear of witches extant in western society 300 years ago. Compare, for example, these words by Harvey Wasserman and Norman Solomon (authors of *Killing Our Own*) that appeared on the editorial page of the *Los Angeles Times* (March 28, 1982) and that were repeated in substance in an ABC Television report in mid-1985:

TMI Unit 1 had opened two years earlier, and Lee suspected that radioactive emissions might be causing some of the "strange goings on" widely reported by local animal owners: deformed chicks hatching, duck eggs not hatching at all, whole litters of stillborn kittens, cows and goats with reproductive problems. with the description of things in England 300 years ago:

For more than a year, the families of Cromwell and Throgmorton continued to persecute her, and to assert that her imps afflicted them with pains and fits, turned the milk sour in their pans, and prevented their cows and ewes from bearing. The notion that ***nuclear*** radiation represents some kind of supernatural hazard, different in kind and magnitude from anything ever before faced by mankind, has become a part of American folklore. It does not seem reasonable to expect these people to be impressed by the difference between a core-melt probability of, say, one in a million per reactor-year and a probability of zero.

If it is true that the public could be reassured by a transparently safe reactor, then it should follow that they should not be so concerned about other ***nuclear energy*** activities that are also transparently safe. The disposal of low-level radioactive waste is a case in point. It is a task that most would agree is technically modest, if not downright trival. Because it is a problem with which the nation is currently grappling, it provides a case study in which to observe U.S. society addressing a transparently safe ***nuclear*** task. My observation is that state officials are acting as if they had been asked to store tons of active bubonic plague bacilli. Questions of which state in a given region should build the first facility and which region within a given state should be chosen as a site are being blown into problems of tremendous moment. The sight of our society converting a technical molehill into a political mountain can hardly make one optimistic that an inherently safe reactor, if developed, would get the U.S. ***nuclear energy*** program back on track.

?

The ***nuclear*** critics

Ignorance alone could not have brought us to our present condition. Besides, it is doubtful that U.S. citizens are more ignorant or superstitious than the citizens of countries in which ***nuclear*** power plants are being constructed with far less difficulty. In a search for additional causes, the OTA offers a list from which to choose. The stakeholders in ***nuclear*** power issues are:

\* Utilities.

\* ***Nuclear*** safety regulators.

\* Critics of ***nuclear*** power.

\* The public.

\* The ***nuclear*** supply industry.

\* Investors and the financial community.

\* State public utility commissions.

It is interesting that the OTA should elevate a particular subset of the public -- namely, the critics of ***nuclear*** power -- to an equal status with the others, but it helps make a point. The OTA Report identifies the ***nuclear*** critics as either organizations with a focus specifically on ***nuclear energy*** (e.g., the Union of Concerned Scientists) or environmental groups, some of whom had their genesis in the environmental legislation of the 1965-1975 period.Examples of the latter are the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC).

One difficulty that arises in seeking the resolution of a ***nuclear*** power issue with a ***nuclear*** critics group is that the group is not in the position of a negotiator. It has no authority. If it should agree to something, the terms of the agreement cannot be enforced. If one ***nuclear*** critics group is satisfied on a given point, a similar group can announce itself dissatisfied. Each has its own drummers, its own agenda.

The situation was described cogently by John Ahearn at the end of his tenure as a ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission commissioner. A *New York Times* reporter asked him if opponents of the Indian Point ***nuclear*** plant, such as the Union of Concerned Scientists, had trouble getting their arguments across to the NRC. Ahearn replied that they had less trouble than the utilities and then observed:

The interest groups really have no responsibility. If they make a misstatement to us, so what? They're in a rush for time. If they lose their case, they've lost that one. They'll come back and try another one.

There are two separate and substantive points in this short statement. The first is that the ***nuclear*** critics have no responsibility. The presence in the resolution-seeking loop of a party with no responsibility is clearly going to produce difficulties. Second is the indication in Ahearn's statement ('They'll come back and try another one.") that any particular issue was secondary to the overall campaign against the ***nuclear*** industry. I believe the evidence is strong that for most ***nuclear*** critic groups, their concern has not been with a particular item on the regulatory agenda at the moment; rather, their goal has been the demise of ***nuclear*** power. The OTA agrees in part:

While some critics feel that ***nuclear*** plants will never be safe enough, others believe that the current regulatory process could ensure safety if it were interpreted consistently and enforced adequately . . . .

I suggest that there is precious little evidence that any of the major groups would settle for anything that would leave a viable, economic ***nuclear*** power industry. Certainly, for those ***nuclear*** critics who believe that ***nuclear*** plants will never be safe enough, the proper place for their case to be argued is in the Congress, which alone has the authority to repeal the Atomic ***Energy*** Act of 1954, thereby declaring that it is no longer the policy of this nation to use ***nuclear*** fission ***energy*** for civilian purposes. For obvious reasons of practical politics, the ***nuclear*** critics did not choose such a frontal assault. Their strategy has been to impede the implementation of the Atomic ***Energy*** Act on carefully chosen occasions such as rulemaking hearings, licensing hearings, etc.

The OTA goes so far as to recommend government funding for the critics:

. . . a funding mechanism for public participation in licensing would ensure that the critics could make a substantive contribution to design and safety issues by enabling them to devote more resources to the identification and analysis of reactor engineering and safety. This would respond to the industry's complaint that the critics are not sufficiently knowledgeable about reactor engineering and safety, as well as to the critics' view that the utility, and to a lesser extent the NRC staff, can devote extensive resources to defending design decisions. It is not at all clear that the critics groups would be interested in making a substantive contribution to design and safety issues. It is very clear, howevrf, that th OTA has no idea of the magnitude of the engineering effort that would be required to do so.

Public participation

Public participation in ***nuclear*** regulatory proceedings has taken place on a much broader scale than just that by the groups identified as "critics of ***nuclear*** power." The NRC operates under a regulation, 10 CFR 2.714, which invites broad participation:

Any person whose interest may be affected by a proceeding and who desires to participate as a party shall file a written petition for leave to intervene. Public participation was also a key element of much environmental legisdlation of teh 1960s and 1970s.On this subject, R. Shep Melnick, in his book, *Regulation and the Courts*, writes:

Previous statutes had required citizens wishing to sue administrators to show that they had suffered direct, concrete harm at the hands of the agency. Almost all the regulatory laws passed in the 1970s, though, authorized "any citizen" to file suit against administrators either for taking unauthorized action or for failing to perform "nondiscretionary" duties. Some statutes even reimburse litigants for their trouble. When combined with detailed statutes, these opportunities for judicial review provided fledgling environmental and consumer groups with powerful resourced within the regulatory process. Clearly, these regulations and statutes opened the proceedings to almost anyone, regardless of qualifications. Pending a thorough and scholarly study of the record, I suggest that in the thousands upon thousands of pages of testimony by members of the public in all of the ***nuclear energy*** hearings, there are very few instances in which a member of the public brought an original idea of substance to the attention of the hearing officers.

In defense of public participation, it is pointed out that it permits values, as well as economic and engineering considerations, to be brought into the decision-making process. While that may be both true and desirable, the value that public participation has usually brought to a ***nuclear*** power hearing has been: "Not in my back yard." Traditionally, public participation has played a larger role in such local affairs as where to locate a sewage treatment plant or whether to close an elementary school. The location of a ***nuclear*** power plant or other associated facility, however, has important regional and national considerations. These have tended to get short shrift in local hearings. Higher levels of public participation that lead to higher levels of the general welfare are not as easily achieved as passing a law making public participation permissible. If public participation in the resolution of environmental issues is to serve the general welfare, it must take place with greater discipline and with a greater sense of the national common good than has been exhibited in ***nuclear*** hearings to date.

The activist judiciary

It has been mentioned that the ***nuclear*** critic groups have neither any particular authority nor any responsibility; they represent no one but themselves. In that case, how could they have been able to contribute so strongly to the failures of the first ***nuclear*** era? Here it is necessary to deal with a player that the OTA fails to mention, namely, the activist judiciary. No history of ***nuclear energy*** in the United States (indeed, no history of the United States) can be written without addressing this phenomenon. The environmental movement provided ample fuel for judicial activism. Melnick treats this subject as it pertained to the Clean Air Act in his*Regulation and the Courts*:

The federal courts have done far more than adjudicate disputes between private parties or prevent administrators from exceeding their statutory authority. They have announced sweeping rulings on policy issues left unresolved by existing regulation, often expanding the scope of government programs in the process. The judges in the courts could not adjust legislation to their ideological bent, however, unless disputes were brought to them. This is the role that lawyers of the EDFs and the NRDCs played; this is the role that gave them their political power. They entered into a symbiotic relationship with their professional counterparts in the judiciary. They filed numerous suits, often based on some obscure point of a regulatory statute. The resulting litigation gave the activist judges, most notably on the bench of the U.S. District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, something to work on. The ***nuclear*** critics received their reward in the form of some highly questionable decision favorable to them. The decision that the psychological stress in the public, induced by the proposed restart of TMI Unit 1, must be evaluated as a condition of relicensing is a case in point.

There is plenty of support, even in the legal profession, for the view that with respect to ***nuclear*** power, judges far overstepped their traditional roles. Regarding a D.C. Court decision in Vermont Yankee versus NRDC, Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist wrote:

To say that the Court of Appeals' final reason for remanding is insubstantial at best is a gross understatement. Consumers Power first applied in 1969 for a construction permit -- not even an operating license, just a construction permit. The proposed plant underwent an incredibly extensive review. The reports filed and reviewed literally fill books. The proceedings took years, and the actual hearings themselves over two weeks. To then nullify that effort seven years later because one report refers to other problems, which problems admittedly have been discussed at length in other reports available to the public, borders on the Kafkaesque. These word well describe the litigious cloud that hung and still hangs over the head of every utility that builds or operates a ***nuclear*** power plant. I can only observe that for the OTA to ignore this fact in the context of judgments on utility management is itself a bit Kafkaesque.

Obviously, the ***nuclear*** critics lost some cases, as NRDC did in the above case. Even in losing, however, the ***nuclear*** critics achieve one of their principal political objectives -- harassment of the ***nuclear*** industry through delay. For a utility with as little as $100 million sunk in a project, interest charges alone are accruing at the rate of $25 000 a day. To the extent that litigation causes delay, the NRDC can, with an investment of a few hundred thousand dollars, inflict millions of dollars of damages on an adversary. It is a very high-yield investment. Thus, the courts become instruments of political harassment.

The Congress

It would hardly be fair to discuss the role of the judiciary in the U.S. ***nuclear*** debacle and fail to acknowledge the major contribution from the legislative branch. In its treatment of the subject, the Congress Office of Technology Assessment somehow fails to mention the Congress of the United States. Possibly operating on the principle of "de Congress nihil nisi bonum," OTA opted for nihil. Not quite so reluctant to assess the performance of Congress in a different context is Professor William Baxter of Stanford's School of Law, who recently returned from Washington aftr a stint as Assistant Attorney General, responsible for the implementation of some antitrust rulings.In the course of an intrview with a member of the campus news service staff, this exchange took place:

q. Is it easy to accomplish things or did you find it more difficult than you though to get a program or proposal across?

A. It depends whether or not accomplishing something requires the cooperation of the Congress. If accomplishing something does, then it is extremely difficult to get anything done -- virtually impossible. And if you don't need the cooperation of the Congress, then it can be done.

Q. If I were to take that one step further, then would you say that Reagan may be having some problems accomplishing his original programs because of the Congress?

A. Oh sure. Congress as an institution is a disaster. Although this observation comes from an experience far afield from ***nuclear energy***, it is a remarkably concise description of the performance of the Congress in that arena. There are few enterprises as dependent as ***nuclear energy*** on the cooperation of the Congress and, therefore, few whose fate is so uncertain.

Probably the greatest single failure of Congress with respect to ***nuclear energy*** has been its failure to legislate and implement a reasonable regulatory process. Running a close second, however, has been its performance in the field of international trade. It is ironic that the OTA Report discusses the possibility of federal support to the U.S. ***nuclear*** industry to encourage reactor export on the reasonable grounds that, with the domestic market for reactors nonexistent, the foreign market might sustain a viable U.S. industry through the hiatus. Through its capricious imposition of retroactive constraints on ***nuclear*** trade agreements, Congress has sent a strong message to the world that the United States is not a reliable supplier in the field of ***nuclear energy***. Most notable among these actions was the passage of the ***Nuclear*** Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, which generally ignored assurances given by previous administrations at the time the United States was seeking signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The NRC

Sooner or later, in trying to explain the U.S. ***nuclear*** scene, one must discuss the NRC. It is easy to lay a large share of the blame for the ***nuclear*** situation at the door of the Commission. It is also easy, and just as true, to say that the NRC is the child of its political environment. Battered by the Congress, the courts, the critics, and a superstitious public, the NRC has not been able to establish itself as a credible regulatory agency that can operate in the mode of the Federal Aviation Administration or the Food and Drug Administration. These agencies manage to walk that fine line that gives due recognition to both the public health and the great contribution that the industries they regulate make. The NRC, however, has become bogged down in trying to oversee countless details of the ***nuclear*** industry. Illustrative of the kind of regulation that goes on in this legalistic mode is this excerpt from a meeting of NRC commissioners and their lawyers (*Inside N.R.C.,* January 21, 1985):

t. You see, it's not only evacuation that you have to worry about. Think of Browns Ferry, there was no release. There was no evacuation. What if a tornady had come up during the time they were trying to bring the trucks in?

B. You are talking about a chance per 10-billion event.

T. Well, that may be true but that, I don't think, is in the record . . . From an engineering standpoint, such a discussion drifts until it is several standard deviations away from reality. In the resulting microsetting, perfectly intelligent people can sit around talking global nonsense. There are millions of chance-per-10-billion combinatorial events that the human mind can conjure. Should a utility, or anyone else, be expected to risk an investment on the hope that every one of them is in the record?

***Nuclear*** utility management

To this point, the discussion has centered on causes of the ***nuclear*** failures that lie outside the industry itself. There is ample reason to include the industry, however. Indeed, at the present time, conventional wisdom has it that the single principal responsibility has been poor management on the part of many utilities. The OTA Report places considerable stress on utility management as a cause. It is a recent article in*Forbes* by James Cook, however, that really focuses in on management:

The failure of the U.S. ***nuclear*** power program ranks as the largest managerial disaster in business history, . . . Cook's supporting data are impressive. He shows the great differences in capital cost of ***nuclear*** plants with comparable completion dates, costs that range five-fold, from $1000 to more than $5000 per kilowatt. He then places the blame squarely on utility management:

Management talent, or the lack of it, is what has made most of the difference in virtually every other ***nuclear*** project as well. The view here is that Cook is making a gross oversimplification. Society, by imposing the retrofits, the interventions and other forms of litigation, has made the construction of a ***nuclear*** plant a vertiable obstacle course, a course in which the obstacles are rearranged every few months. The plant-to-plant differences in the difficulty of the obstacles have been to some extent a mattr of luck. Clearly, some utility managers became more proficient at negotiating the courses than others. There are also cases of evident poor management. A judgment on managerial performance that is based simply on a dollar-per-kilowatt comparison between certain plants, however, will hardly lead to a correct diagnosis. Some plant-specific corrections should be made for the acts of God and man. It will be unfortunate if the book on the first ***nuclear*** era in the United States is closed with the simplistic diagnosis that it was primarily due to poor utility management.

At the present moment, of course, that is a very appealing conclusion for many parties. It relieves so many of them (the ***nuclear*** critics, the public, the courts, the Congress, the NRC) of responsibility. For the consumer groups, who will be asking the utility commission to disallow much of the ***nuclear*** plants costs for rate-setting purposes, the utility mis-management story is a godsend. After all, one can hardly assess a ***nuclear*** critic, such as the NRDC, for its share of the responsibility for high ***nuclear*** costs.

It is not a question of defending utility managers. The important question is what ***nuclear energy*** policy is in the long-term national interests. If the inclusion of more ***nuclear*** plants in the nation's electric generating mix is in the national interest, then their exclusion on the basis of some cases of poor utility management is patently ridiculous. Surely there are enough cases of successfully operating ***nuclear*** utilities to give confidence that the management problem can be solved.

The future of ***nuclear energy***

There is a consensus that ***nuclear*** power has become a highly politicized issue. From an investment standpoint, this means that logic in the process is either missing or well obscured. Society has sent the nation's utilities a message that they make capital-intensive investments in efficient generating plants at their own risk. A cost-regulated, risk-taking utility is a contradiction in terms, so there is no reason to expect the utilities to make those investments. The uncertainty surrounding the financial outcome of the next reactor order will be very large indeed, so large, in fact, that the federal government is probably the only institution that could undertake it. According to this logic, therefore, the restart of orders in the United States is not foreseeable.

There will be a ***nuclear*** industry for the foreseeable future, however. The ***nuclear*** component of the electric utility industry alone represents a $100 to $200-billion investment. Its electricity output will have an annual value of $20 to$40 billion. If there is never a new plant ordered, some of the existing ones will probably be operating well into the second quarter of the 21st century. Aside from the utilities themselves, the ***nuclear*** contractors and suppliers will have a multi-billion-dollar annual business supplying such products and services as new fuel, replacement parts, spent-fuel management, regulatory support, etc. In the absence of new reactor orders, the reactor-building industry will evolve into a service industry. The metamorphosis is clearly under way.

There are important differences between a ***nuclear*** industry interested in selling power plants and one interested in selling services, however. ***Nuclear*** waste disposal provides a good example. A reactor-building industry would work to see that ***nuclear*** waste disposal is carried out efficiently because it would be anxious to maintain competitiveness with coal-burning stations. A ***nuclear*** service industry, on the other hand, will not be troubled to see the cost of ***nuclear*** waste disposal rise. The ***Nuclear*** Waste Policy Act of 1982 imposes a surcharge of one mill per kilowatt-hour on ***nuclear*** electricity to defray the cost of development of a waste disposal system. This surcharge should soon be generating an annual cash flow of $500 million, enough to sustain a modest but comfortable Washington bureaucracy with its client contractors. Why should anyone want to turn off that flow? The OTA Report gives as a noncontroversial, necessary condition for new ***nuclear*** plant orders that there be a convincing waste disposal program. We will have a program, but it will not consign any waste irretrievably to the earth for decades to come. How many will find the program convincing is an open question. An added irony is that the nation's military ***nuclear*** program made the development of ***nuclear*** waste disposal procedures mandatory even if a ***nuclear*** power progrm had never existed.

Within the ***nuclear*** industry, there is an on-going discussion of the development of some new class of reactor (e.g., a smaller scale reactor; a modular, gas-cooled reactor) on the grounds that such a development might inaugurate the second ***nuclear*** era. In this regard, the Weinberg Report is particularly disappointing. It simply ignores history. It recommends that the United States undertake to develop an inherently safe reactor, expecting that developing a 100-megawatt prototype might take 10-12 years. The group would have done well to review previous development efforts in this country. A partial list of projects development efforts in this country. A partial list of projects that did not come to a successful conclusion must include the various liquid-fuel reactor projects, the experiemental gas-cooled reactor, the light-water breeder reactor, the Clinch River breeder reactor, etc. The chances of a successful outcome to a 10-year development project, starting today, has to be reckoned as very low.

The same can be said for the Department of ***Energy***'s Civilian Reactor Program, which presumably will be "keeping the ***nuclear*** option open." The ***nuclear*** option is not a simple open-and-shut matter. As each year passes without a new ***nuclear*** plant order, the competence, readiness, even the willingness to respond to a new reactor order diminishes.The capability to respond has undoubtedly diminished already. The longer the United States goes without building a new commercial ***nuclear*** plant, the more expensive and more uncertain will be the restart of that activity. In any case, the DOE Civilian Reactor Program is not going to keep any option open. It lacks the budget, continuity, coordination, preseverance, thrust, and toughness to produce a commercial product.

This scenario, if true, is of no more than passing interest unless the absence of ***nuclear*** power plants from the utilties' options for their future generating mix is of national importance. The viewpoint here is that it is indeed important, but that the reality can be obscured for years. If there is one lesson to be learned from the "***energy*** crisis" years, it is that causes and effects can be separated by huge spans of time. Higher oil prices really do bring a decrease in oil demand, but not overnight. The results of poor policy may become manifest only over a long period of time.

There is little doubt that higher prices for electricity will reduce demand growth. It will be said, and with reason, that electricity conservation is cheaper than ***nuclear*** electricity. Conservation that is driven by unnecessarily high costs, however, is a decidedly second-best solution. The prolonged construction times of ***nuclear*** power plants represent in themselves a major failure to conserve such factors as capital and labor. Electricity conservation on the demand side is a reasonable consumer response to a failure of conservation on the supply side, but it does not redress that failure.

In sum, the ***nuclear*** option is going to be missing in the United States for a long time, with significant detrimental effects. In his indictment of nucler utility management, James Cook asks the question:

Can a technology as rigorous and demanding and, for all that, as useful as ***nuclear*** powre find a place in a society as open as the U.S.? The simple answer to that question is that ***nuclear*** power has a place in U.S. society and will have for the foreseeable future. If Cook's question is rephrased to ask whether U.S. society can deal competently and wisely with ***nuclear*** power, then the evidence to date supports a negative answer. Moreover, it is much more a societal failure than is acknowledged in the analyses of the OTA or Dr. Weinberg and his colleagues.
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***Energy*** for the coming decades

You are right to caution about the temporary nature of the oil price slump (''***Energy*** saving still matters,'' March 3 issue). The danger signs are all around us.

Conversion of an oil-burning power plant to coal is being held up by regulators because of the temporary price advantages. The bottom is falling out of renewable ***energy*** markets. We are even giving up exploration for new oil, and continue to ignore the ***nuclear*** option.

The largest oil-producing nation, the Soviet Union, recently announced its intention to double ***nuclear*** capacity over the next five years. They expect ***nuclear*** power to provide 30 percent of their total ***energy*** requirement by the turn of the century.

This story is being repeated in 24 other countries around the world. France already receives two-thirds of its electricity from ***nuclear***.

In the US, a 300 percent increase in ***nuclear energy*** use helped our utilities achieve a 60 percent decrease in oil use since 1973, but we have not ordered a ***nuclear*** plant since 1978. Utility executives across the board assure us that no more will be ordered until ***nuclear*** regulation becomes more rational. What will we use as a hedge against oil prices and supplies?

Prof. Gilbert Brown, University of Lowell, College of Engineering, Lowell, Mass.

*Letters are welcome. Only a selection can be published, subject to condensation, and none acknowledged. Please address to ''readers write.''*
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The European Parliament yesterday called for an international conference to establish ***nuclear*** safety rules in the aftermath of Chernobyl, and to set up a rapid response force of experts to deal with ***nuclear*** accidents anywhere in the world.

The Parliament criticized Moscow's 'underhand attempts to conceal its responsibility' for the disaster and demanded compensation from the Kremlin for damage caused to European crops and foodstuffs.

Regarding EEC compensation claims, the Commission said it would draw up a detailed report on damage suffered by European farmers and others as a result of Chernobyl fall-out.

Mr Stanley Clinton Davis, Commissioner for the Environment, told Parliament that the Commission had acted swiftly, using its own powers to ban fresh meat from Eastern Europe, but had run into delays over milk, fruit and vegetables because of the need to consult member governments.

It was not too much to ask for greater Commission powers to ensure a speedy response in future, Mr Clinton Davis said.

A resolution evolved by West German Socialists and Greens, and put forward by a loose left-wing coalition, called for the abandonment of ***nuclear energy*** in Europe and the closure of ***nuclear*** power plants 'prone to breakdown'.

However, the motion was narrowly defeated, after French Socialists and Italian Communist MEPs had defected in order to support a rival centre-right motion.

Mr Nicolas Mosar, Commissioner for ***Energy***, appeared before a crowded chamber to declare that abandonment of ***nuclear energy*** would create 'very serious difficulties' for the EEC and would mean a return to 'dangerous dependence on imported oil'.

After an unprecedentedly lengthy debate, in which feelings ran high against both Soviet secrecy and the complacency of the Western ***nuclear*** industry, Parliament backed a centre-right resolution calling on the Commission and the governments of the Twelve to formulate a common EEC position on the setting up of an international authority to co-ordinate expert intervention in the case of a ***nuclear*** accident or terrorist attack.

The proposed authority would also negotiate new rules requiring countries to report immediately on accidents to the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency in Vienna.

The resolution, passed by 271 votes to 32 with 30 abstentions, called for effective international inspection and common EEC standrds on ***nuclear*** safety and reactor design.

The Parliament approved a Christian Democrat resolution deploring excessive national restrictions in EEC countries on milk and vegetable products 'in the confusion of the moment,' and putting the blame squarely on the Soviet Union for the destruction of European agricultural products.

The Assembly urged EEC ministers to evaluate the damage and present Moscow with a bill for compensation.

Mr Clinton Davis said that EEC experts who had originally been asked for a report on Sellafield had last week advised him that EEC standards on radiation levels did not need revision. 'I cannot agree', the Commissioner said.

Because of incomplete data the Commission had not been able to act promptly as a 'clearing house' for Community action, Mr Clinton Davis went on. Openness in ***nuclear*** affairs was the only way to allay public anxieties. 'There is absolutely no complacency on the part of the Commission,' Mr Clinton Davis concluded.

The Parliament's resolution called for EEC food and medical aid for Russia, and asked the Commission to report on the long-term implications of Chernobyl for the health of Europe's population.

A resolution tabled by British Conservative MEPs making EEC food aid dependent on human rights concessions by Moscow, was defeated.

The Commission announced that it was sending 400 tonnes of milk powder to Warsaw for Polish children at the request of the Polish Episcopate, a decision warmly welcomed by Sir Henry Plumb, leader of the British Conservative group at Strasbourg.

**Load-Date:** April 16, 2004
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THE Chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant disaster may have resulted in an indirect benefit for companies that provide other forms of ***energy***.

Analysts say that producers of gas, coal and oil may have had their future earnings and equity appreciation prospects brightened as the ***energy*** industry intensifies its quest for alternatives to ***nuclear*** power.

To some experts the effects on the ***energy*** industry from the Russian disaster can be equated with what happened following the Arab oil embargo in 1973, when rising oil costs spurred shifts to such traditional ***energy*** sources as coal and natural gas. Other analysts, however, are more cautious. Although companies that took the ***nuclear*** route paid the highest dividends of any ***energy*** group, this has not halted their slide from favor since the accident in 1979 involving the Three Mile Island ***nuclear*** reactor in this country.

''In the wake of Chernobyl many people who own ***nuclear*** stocks have either sold them or will sell them and reinvest some of that capital into a logical extension - natural gas and coal,'' said John Slatter, utilities analyst at Prescott, Ball & Turben in Cleveland.

In light of the current situation, Mr. Slatter says he likes the Delmarva Power and Light Company, the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, the Duke Power Company and the Northern States Power Company.

While Baltimore Gas and Duke Power have ***nuclear*** plants, those facilities have been completed and therefore do not face the problems of cost overruns, delays, rules and regulations pertaining to construction of new ***nuclear*** plants, or public opposition to completion of plants.

''If a shift away from ***nuclear energy*** to other ***energy*** sources does in fact constitute a trend, there will be upward price pressure on nonnuclear ***energy*** sources such as coal, gas and oil,'' said Richard Schmidt, director of research of the Advest Group Inc. in Hartford. ''I would be very con-cerned about the stocks of companies that are involved in major ***nuclear*** construction projects.''

Mr. Schmidt says his firm likes electrical utilities that have no significant ***nuclear*** exposures, such as Allegheny Power System Inc. and the Midwest ***Energy*** Company; gas concerns such as the Bay State Gas Company and the Providence ***Energy*** Corporation; the Mobil and Exxon Corporations among the oils, which may experience some firming of prices, and, among the coals, the Pittston Company, on the assumption that some utilities might choose limited coal use.

''Natural gas local distribution companies are safe havens for income-conscious investors,'' said Barry Sahgal, ***energy*** analyst at Ladenburg, Thalmann & Company.

He said that adequate supplies of gas, improved responsiveness to competitive pricing, a better regulatory environment, stronger balance sheets, predictable cash flows and prospects for dividend growth most likely would continue to attract investor interest in the local distribution group.

Mr. Sahgal said his investment recommendations would include the Brooklyn Union Gas Company, the Connecticut ***Energy*** Corporation and the Public Service Company of North Carolina.

''Investors should view the Chernobyl disaster as an opportunity to invest in quality companies with strong fundamentals where they might realize a longer-term benefit rather than instant gratification,'' Mr. Saghal added.

While most of the focus away from ***nuclear*** power has been on traditional ***energy***, more exotic forms are also drawing interest.

''Since the oil embargo, a vigorous industry of independent power producers has emerged,'' said Donald Marier, publisher of Alternative Sources of ***Energy***, the magazine of the independent power production industry. ''The Chernobyl disaster should cause investors to take a closer look at the independents who often use renewable ***energy*** sources.''

Mr. Marier said the technologies currently being developed or improved upon include renewable sources such as geothermal ***energy***, solar ***energy*** and water and wind power.

Mr. Marier said independents that might possibly benefit from the continued swing away from ***nuclear energy*** include the Catalyst ***Energy*** Development Corporation and Cogenic ***Energy*** Systems in cogeneration; Ultrasystems Inc. in wood-fired cogeneration systems, and ***Energy*** Conversion Devices and the Chronar Corporation in solar cell ***energy***.

A cogeneration plant produces steam for heating or cooling and also produces electricity. Some cogeneration plants are operated from fossil fuels while others are fired from solid wastes or from biomass, wood or agricultural wastes.

Analysts see continuing growth opportunities for independent power producers, particularly in ''rate-shock'' areas where consumers face large electrical rate increases with ***nuclear*** power plants coming into the rate base.
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faced with falling prices for imported fuels but scant domestic ***energy*** resources, yugoslavia is asking itself to be or not to be in deciding if it should go ahead and greatly expand its ***nuclear*** generating capacity.

at a recent conference on the country's ***energy*** development, experts debated whether this ***energy***-poor european nation should make ***nuclear*** generating its top priority in the effort to solve tugoslavia's chronic ***energy*** shortages.

yugoslav ***energy*** ministry experts insisted that the country has no other way than building ***nuclear*** power plants to solve the ***energy*** problem.

these experts predict that in the next decade, yugoslavia will face major problems if it does not add ***nuclear*** power stations to its already overheated electrical production system, which generates about 77 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, half of what they estimate will be needed by the year 2000.

yugoslavia, which was only insufficient coal reserves and limited hydro-electric resources, worked out a plan last october to build four ***nuclear*** generating stations with a total of generating capacity of four million kilowatts by the end of the century. it has one existing ***nuclear*** station.

negotiations are already underway with foreign firms on their possible role in the field.

the plan, however, has aroused controversy in recent months. opponents said that instead of spending a huge amount of money on these plants the country, which already has foreign debts of 20.7 billion u.s. dollars, should expand its conventional electrical generating capability. the recent drop in world oil prices has helped back up the conventional generating argument, and some opponents of the ***nuclear*** plan also warn about the environmental dangers of ***nuclear*** power.

however, experts from the ***energy*** ministry said that the country should not rely on imported ***energy*** as a way out and that in the long run ***nuclear energy*** would be the key to solving ***energy*** shortages.

the experts estimate that yugoslavia could provide 60 percent of the equipment to build the four ***nuclear*** plants, with the rest being imported and paid for with labor exports and by other means.
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THE most serious ***nuclear*** power accident to date has occurred at the Chernobyl plant in the Soviet Ukraine. These points should be made:

\* Moscow was lamentably irresponsible as a world citizen in failing to announce immediately and in detail what had happened. To fail to report the mishap until days later, after routine radiation checks on workers in Sweden, was to deprive the public in the Soviet Union and neighboring countries of the right to take simple precautions.

\* The Soviet Union was irresponsible, again as a world citizen, in failing to encase the Chernobyl reactor, and others like it, in a proper containment vessel to minimize a system failure. In ***nuclear*** matters, for ***energy*** or military uses, arguments of economy where adequate safety is concerned do not apply.

\* President Reagan should insist that peaceful ***nuclear energy*** standards be included in the next superpower summit agenda, as well as arms control, human rights, and third-world conflict issues. He was right to offer US technical and humanitarian aid. But Mr. Reagan should do more to highlight the need for universal standards for the design, siting, building, and operation of ***nuclear energy*** facilities.

The Chernobyl incident illustrates the arbitrariness, the misery, perpetuated by Moscow in the Iron Curtain's political division of East and West.

Where the environment is concerned, there is one world. Atmospheric currents, the earth's waters, are shared by all peoples. The Soviets have no right either to contaminate the shared environment or to hide what can and must be learned from the experience.

There will be other likely fallouts.

Within the Soviet Union, whatever rudimentary environmental movement exists should be given added life. The Soviets will have to learn from the Americans, the French, and others an improved approach to safety. In the United States, as much as 90 percent of the cost of new plants is attributable directly or indirectly to safety. Despite the protests over such safety requirements - either from those who complain they unduly impede development, or from those who find them inadequately carried out or enforced - such protests are the price of exploring a new technology with potentially grave consequences for the habitat. The Soviets should postpone their plans to double their ***nuclear*** power capacity within the next few years, albeit with plants of a different design than Chernobyl's, until international standards for safety and design are met.

Within other countries, a second look at ***nuclear*** expansion should be demanded. The glut of oil and gas worldwide permits such a hiatus.

In the US, where some 100 ***nuclear*** power plants are running and 30 more are to be finished in the next five years, the issues over many of the problem plants are largely resolved. But the industry is still troubled. The ***nuclear*** construction and regulatory system does not work well. An electric ***energy*** surplus will exist in most regions in the next decade. Utility companies are hardly encouraged toward expansion, given the long lead times, expense, unfavorable investment outlook, and now - because of Chernobyl - a resurgence of caution in political and antinuclear quarters.

The battle over ***nuclear*** power has been bitter. On one side are the ''soft'' ***energy*** advocates, a strong antinuclear coalition. On the other are those who argue no ***energy*** source is risk free.

Inside the USSR and out, the current period of low prices and oversupply in oil and gas is thought likely to increase ***energy*** demand. For the US, a $10-a-barrel price for oil could lead to a doubling of imports in five years, Data Resources Inc. estimates. Hence, Chernobyl's tragic cost in human suffering may not alter the underlying economic factors that encourage using ***nuclear*** power.

Nonetheless, policies and procedures should immediately be adopted to inform the world community promptly of ***nuclear*** mishaps and mistakes. The Soviet Union cannot be allowed to imagine it can impose a news and information blackout, and avoid remedial steps for its ***nuclear*** industry, as if it had no responsibility to its own peoples, the East bloc, or the rest of the world.
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M. D. B. Carlisle, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Russell A. Rourke, resigned.

A. David Rossin, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of ***Energy*** (***Nuclear Energy***), vice Shelby Templeton Brewer, resigned.

The following-named persons to be members of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs for terms expiring May 8, 1989:

Marge Bodwell, of New Mexico (reappointment).

Naomi Brummond, of Nebraska, vice Mary Jo Arndt.

Lilli K. Dollinger Hausenfluck, of Virginia (reappointment).

Marcilyn D. Leier, of Minnesota (reappointment).

Virginia Gillham Tinsley, of Arizona (reappointment).

John Agresto, of the District of Columbia, to be Archivist of the United States (new position).

R. Kenneth Towery, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring March 26, 1991 (reappointment).

Marvin Duncan, of Missouri, to be a member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term of 4 years.

Frank W. Naylor, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term of 6 years.
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despite the recent ***nuclear*** power plant accident in soviet union, the safety of ***nuclear energy*** generating technology should not be doubted, helga steeg, executive director of the international ***energy*** agency(iea), said today.

the director of the 21 nation organization which co-ordinates the ***energy*** supply policy among its member states said at a press conference here that some critics may use the chernobyl ***nuclear*** station accident to exaggerate the danger of ***nuclear*** power generation.

but ***nuclear*** power plants of iea member countries are all built and run under strict safety regulations and the iea has solved safety questions involved in ***nuclear*** generation such as ***nuclear*** waste treatment, she said.

the soviet union last night said that one of the ***nuclear*** reactors at its chernobyl plant 50 km north of kiev had been damaged and high levels of radio-activity have been reported in some scandinavian countries.

earlier today, an official of the french electric company said that, according to data available, the soviet ***nuclear*** plant may not have been equipped with steam cooling circulation and a thick reinforced concrete containment shell.the reactor was thus damaged by enormous heat which resulted in a radio-active gas leak.

meanwhile, a french enviromental protection agency, le service de protection centre les rayonnements ionisants(scpri), said the radio-activity is higher than usual in the north europe because of the chernobyl accident, "but it has not posed a danger to inhabitants" there.

it has ordered its 130 subsidiaries to strengthen pollution monitoring of the air, water and milk in france.
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The Soviet Union is helping Cuba build two ***nuclear*** power reactors, touching off expressions of concern by two members of Congress that an accident in Cuba similar to the one in the Ukraine could unleash radioactive particles over the United States.

But a State Department official and a private ***nuclear*** power expert said that, because of newer technology, the Cuban reactors appear to be safer than the damaged reactor at the Ukranian ***nuclear*** station at Chernobyl.

In a letter delivered to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, Sen. Paula Hawkins, R-Fla., called on the Soviets to halt the project, which is under construction in the south coast city of Cienfuegos, about 200 miles from the Florida coast.

"I urge the Soviet government to acknowledge its responsibility to the rest of the international community for the safety of ***nuclear*** power facilities and halt the construction of the facility in Cuba," Mrs. Hawkins wrote.

Rep. Dante Fascell, D-Fla., chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said Tuesday he had asked the State Department and the Organization of American States to verify with Cuban authorities that adequate safeguards are in place.

"Unless this is done, the plant could pose a threat not only to the United States, particularly to Florida, but to the Caribbean and Central America as well and equally to the citizens of Cuba themselves," Fascell said.

Fascell's office said no response had been received from the State Department or the OAS as of Thursday.

But Marcello Alonzo, a Cuban-born ***nuclear*** physicist who once served on the Inter-American ***Nuclear Energy*** Commission, said the Cuban reactors are being constructed with pressurized water reactors. Unlike the Chernobyl reactor, they do not have graphite cores.

"There cannot be a similar accident because the reactors, while both desiged by the Soviets, are so different. An accident of the type that occurred in the Soviet Union is impossible because there is no graphite to ignite," he said. He also noted the Cuban reactors will have containment shells.

Roland Draxler, meteorologist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said that in the event of a serious ***nuclear*** accident in Cuba, a southerly wind could carry radioactive particles over the American mainland.

He said southerly winds in the Caribbean are particularly common in the late summer and early fall, which is the hurricane season in that region.

A 1985 article in the Cuban magazine "Cuba Socialista" said the reactors are being built to withstand the "improbable circumstance" of a hurricane, earthquake or airplane crash.

The Cuban diplomatic mission in Washington was closed Thursday for the May Day holiday, but a mission spokesman, Angel Pino, was quoted in published reports earlier this week as saying, "The project is progressing well. There is no reason for worry or concern."

President Fidel Castro, whose son, Fidelito, is executive secretary of the ***Nuclear Energy*** Commission of Cuba, has repeatedly stressed that the containment structures will ensure the safety of the Cuban people in the event of an accident.

In addition to the two reactors in Cienfuegos, additional reactors are planned for eastern and western Cuba as part of a long-range plan to minimize Cuban dependence on oil.

"Our ***energy*** must be based on ***nuclear*** plants," Castro has said. Two years ago, Castro said there were 188 Soviet advisers at work on the project, but last month a Soviet technician interviewed on Cuban television said the Soviet team there numbered 300.

A State Department official, who asked not to be identified, also said newer technology is being used at the Cienfuegos project, which will be fueled with slightly enriched uranium provided by the Soviets.

Plants similar to the one under construction in Cuba have been built in Eastern Europe and Finland, the official said. He added that the facilities initially were supposed to have opened last year but now are expected to begin functioning in three or four years.
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[***ARGENTINA ENERGY PORTFOLIO SHUFFLE PROMPTS NUCLEAR INDUSSTRY OPTIMISM***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3SJB-0C40-0010-21NJ-00000-00&context=1516831)

Nucleonics Week

April 17, 1986

Copyright 1986 McGraw-Hill, Inc.

**Section:** Vol. 27, No. 16; Pg. 5

**Length:** 377 words

**Byline:** Richard Kessler, Buenos Aires

**Body**

Argentine ***nuclear*** industry leaders are cautiously optimistic that new ***Energy*** Secretary Jorge Lapena will look more favorably on the need for additional ***nuclear*** stations than his predecessor Conrado Storani. The former ***energy*** planning subsecretary, Lapena, 39, is a low-key apolitical technocrat, who authored the 1985-2000 national ***energy*** program. That program leaves open the possibility of building a 700-MW ***nuclear*** station in the 199s after the 698-MW Atucha-2, now 45% complete, comes on line in late 1992.

Industry executives said that the outspoken Storani, who openly favored oil and gas development over ***nuclear energy***, wanted further station construction after Atucha-2 postponed until the next century.They contended that such a move would be disastrous for an industry already saddled with expensive surplus manufacturing capacity and professional payrolls. President Raul Alfonsin recently decided the issue against Storani by authorizing Comision Nacional de Energia Atomica (CNEA) to carry out a one-year feasibility study for a fourth unit. Industry sources said Lapena is more likely to judge ***nuclear*** fuel cycle projects on their technical and economic merits than Storani, who took a more political approach with ***energy*** matters.

However, Alfonsin is asserting more direct personal control over the ***nuclear*** program. Alfonsin has reportedly turned sour on the state oil company, whose growing operating losses are threatening the financial stability of the national treasury. The growing treasury deficit threatens to rekindle triple-digit inflation, which Alfonsin fears would undermine domestic and foreign support for his government. Estimated costs are also souring for proposed hydroelectric schemes, most of which are binational projects with Paraguay, whose authoritarian government has touchy relations with democratic Argentina.

Lapena is also expected to counsel Alfonsin to take a hard look at the sluggish demand curve for ***energy*** before endorsing any new ***energy*** project. That cautious, balanced approach as an ***energy*** planner earned Lapena the enmity of certain opposition Peronists and nationalists, who want open-ended ***nuclear*** development, but most industry officials view Lapena as positive for ***nuclear*** growth.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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The International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency (IAEA) said yesterday it would be willing to provide assistance on request from the Soviet Union following this weekend's ***nuclear*** accident.

The Vienna-based agency was informed on Monday night but was given no details of the scale or time of the accident at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant north of Kiev, a spokesman said.

Information suggested it was a "very bad accident." It was likely to have caused "irreparable damage to the plant."

The IAEA was established in 1957 by the United Nations to help to promote the peaceful use of ***nuclear energy***. It has no policing functions and provides advice and assistance only on request.

Although it can recommend safety procedures - it usually asks governments embarking on a ***nuclear*** programme to set up a regulatory authority - the choice of safety procedures is up to individual governments.

Last year, the Soviet Union signed a safeguard agreement with the IAEA which allowed international inspection of some of its ***nuclear*** facilities for the first time.

The safeguard aims to ensure that ***nuclear*** materials and equipment intended for peaceful use are not diverted to military purposes. The agreement, however, does not cover safety.

Moscow's decision followed similar moves by the US, Britain and France. Countries which have a ***nuclear*** military capacity are not bound to allow IAEA inspection.

Britain has listed all its ***nuclear*** utilities for inspection, while the US and France permit only some to be visited. The Soviet Union has given a list of five facilities open for inspection.
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Gemeinschaftskernkraftwerk Neckar (GKN) is expected to decide by the end of this month whether or not to take its first delivery of Chinese uranium in 1986. The utility, which operates one 855-MW PWR and is building a second unit of 1,301-MW capacity at Neckarwestheim in southern Germany, signed a contract in December 1985 with the China ***Nuclear Energy*** Industry Corp. (CNEIC) for purchase of Chinese uranium from now to 2000 (NF, 27 Jan., 1).

A company official confirmed that the total quantity could be around 1,200 metric tons U (corresponding to 3,120,000 lb U3O8), although he said that the amount GKN will actually take will depend on the price levels established through annual bilateral negotiations. The Chinese uranium will satisfy about a quarter of the total needs (of about 350 MTU/yr) of the two Neckar stations during the 1990s. GKN expects to pay CNEIC in excess of 200-million DM ($86-million at current exchange rates) over the life of the contract, but the official said it was impossible to predict the contract's value accurately, as it will depend not only on how much uranium is taken, but also on dollar-mark exchange rates during the next 14 years. The GKN-CNEIC contract is denominated in dollars.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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Prime Minister Mohammad Khan Junejo on April 26 asked "our friends," the U.S. and China, to help Pakistan's peaceful ***nuclear*** power program in order to tide the country over power shortages forcing compulsory backouts all over the country. Junejo made the plea at the inauguration of two thermal power plants at the Guddu complex in Sind, set up in part by China Machinery Import Corp. The inauguration ceremony was attended by Chinese Vice Minister for Machine Building & Industry Zhao Shen Ming.

The Pakistani prime minister said that, as a sovereign and independent state, Pakistan has the right to use every modern technology including ***nuclear*** to improve the living conditions of its people. He reiterated that Pakistan's ***nuclear*** program is for peaceful purposes and asserted, "We do not have to give repeated assurances on this account to anybody." He said, "We believe that our friends will help us in the use of this technology, as they have helped us in other ***energy*** fields."

There have been intermittent reports of Pakistan-China ***nuclear*** cooperation in the past, always denied by the two sides, and this was the first time that Pakistan has publicly sought assistance in this field from China. In a message read out on his behalf, U.S. Ambassador Deane R. Hinton said his country is willing to help Pakistan in ***nuclear*** technology, if its peaceful uses are verified by international inspections. Speaking the next day in Multan, Hinton said he doubted if Pakistan could bail out of its current ***energy*** crisis without developing ***nuclear energy***.

[*URL: http://www.platts.com*](URL: http://www.platts.com)
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ENI chairman Franco Reviglio forecasts that oil prices will average $15-16/bbl this year, increasing to about $18/bbl at yearend.

If his prediction comes true and if Italian products consumption holds steady, the savings for the national economy could amount to 18-trillion lire, 50% more than that forecast earlier this year by ***energy*** economists who projected crude at $20/bbl.

Commenting further at a presentation on a market report issued by the European Research Center based here, Reviglio said that "this era of easy ***energy***" is transitory and bound to end within two to four years, when the market will once more favor the sellers.

Therefore, he recommended, now is the time to develop a genuine ***energy*** policy that will reduce Italy's vulnerability to price shocks when the market strengthens.

Reviglio stressed that he's not "proposing to start again with a new ***nuclear energy*** program" and suggested that the government set up a fund devoted to ***energy*** investments, particularly in hydrocarbons exploration/development.

Noting that the ***energy*** crises of 1974 and 1979 weighed heavily on Italy because of its import dependency, economist Luigi Spaventa, scientific director of the center, called for "an insurance policy against a new oil shock," centering on reduced inflation and increased growth.URL: [*http://www.platts.com*](http://www.platts.com)
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Political fallout from the ***nuclear*** disaster in the Soviet Union is expected to have a devastating impact on ***nuclear*** initiatives on Capitol Hill, with licensing reform and insurance coverage among the casualties last week.

As the week ended, lobbyists for the ***nuclear*** industry and the Reagan administration were assessing damage to what had been, at least in a couple of instances, encouraging campaigns.

Legislation reforming the federal licensing process for ***nuclear*** plants, which appeared headed for passage in the House ***Energy*** subcommittee on conservation and power, was dealt a setback as Chairman Edward Markey, D-Mass., indicated he wanted to put the issue off until he had time to explore the Soviet disaster.

Only weeks earlier, Markey, a persistent critic of ***nuclear energy***, had agreed to take up the legislation after a majority of his panel expressed support for the bill (*IE/FL,* 21 April, 1).

And in the House Interior Committee, efforts to mark up legislation extending the Price-Anderson ***nuclear***-insurance law broke down over the extent to which a utility should be liable for a ***nuclear*** accident. The panel had voted a week earlier to set an $8-billion limit, but industry last week sought to have that figure cut to $2 billion. Said Rep. John Seiberling, D-Ohio, a supporter of the $8-billion limit: "The timing of this couldn't be worse."

One DOE official said the department intends to continue its pursuit of ***nuclear*** bills, such as licensing reform, despite congressional reaction to the accident. But another official maintained that securing that type of legislation will be "tough as hell" now.

In convening a hearing on licensing reform last week, Markey recalled that former ***Energy*** Secretary James Schlesinger was appearing before another committee on behalf of a similar bill when the Three Mile Island accident occured in 1979. "If it is true that timing is everything in politics, then the issue of ***nuclear*** licensing reform is cursed with fortuity," Markey quipped.

"The Soviet tragedy provides a glaring example of the dangers of ***nuclear*** power if public pressure for safety is stifled and if the public is not involved in the licensing process," he said.

Supporters of licensing reform pressed Markey for markup by July. Said Rep. Ralph Hall, R-Tex.: We've had the wagons circled on this issue for a long time, and we've sent out the scouts and marked the territory. And we've gotten back indications that we know enough about the territory to move on."

But Markey's rejoinder offered little hope for fast action. "I have scouts out," the chairman said, "and they tell me a ***nuclear*** cloud is heading our way. So, we're going to try to keep the wagons circled for a while longer until this passes over and we can assess what the cause of its was and learn some lessons."

House Interior, where a handful of non-controversial technical amendments appeared to be the only obstacles to completing work on Price-Anderson, put the issue off indefinitely after Rep. Ron Marlenee, R-Mont., offered the measure cutting liability to $2 billion. "I don't see how, in light of the event in the Soviet Union, members can face their constitutes and tell them that they voted to reduce coverage in the event of a similar accident in this country from $8 billion to $2 billion," Seiberling said. "If reports on the Soviet accident are accurate, the damage could be astronomical."

Discussion of the Soviet accident prompted Rep. Don Young of Alaska, ranking Republican on the committee, to complain about "the hysterical attitude" of some of his colleagues and question reports on the magnitude of the damage. "It occurs to me that those who want to destroy this ***energy*** forever are very excited about what happened in Russia," Young said. "I just wonder what's going to happen when we find out all those hysterical reports are not true."

A number of hearings on the Soviet accident and possible implications for ***nuclear energy*** in the U.S. were shaping up last week. Among them is a session to be held Tuesday by the House Appropriations subcommittee on ***energy*** and water development, which wants to explore reactor safety. Members of the Senate ***Energy*** Committee said they also might take up the issue.

[*http://www.platts.com*](http://www.platts.com)
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Nations around the world checked radiation levels over their cities Tuesday and watched nervously to see where winds would take the cloud of invisible radioactive dust from the Soviet ***nuclear*** disaster in the Ukraine.

A U.N. official raised the possibility of "the world's first radiation refugees."

Danes rushed to drug stores to buy iodine pills, which help keep the thyroid gland from absorbing radioactivity.

The ominous cloud shifted and began moving from Scandinavia back toward Central Europe. Poland ordered emergency measures.

Barry Smith, a research scientist at the British Meteorological Office, said light winds were pushing the radioactive dust to the east and south, on a return course to Soviet territory.

The cloud was moving slowly, he said, would pass over Poland and East Germany, and, "It seems very unlikely that it will get beyond the Alps by the weekend."

Smith said the amount of radiation deposited on land should be small beyond 30 miles from the damaged Chernobyl plant.

Prime Minister Poul Schlueter of Denmark expressed outrage that the Soviet Union had not immediately notified the world about the accident, which appeared to be a reactor meltdown that occurred late last week.

"Several days have passed … and that is totally insufficient," he said. It shouldn't be that way in a modern society."

The Soviet government acknowledged the accident Monday.

Although it said Tuesday that the "radiation situation" had been stabilized at Chernobyl, 60 miles from the 2.4 million people of Kiev and 450 miles southwest of Moscow, the Kremlin asked Sweden and West Germany for advice on combatting graphite fires in ***nuclear*** plants.

"That must be the worst (accident) that has ever happened in the peaceful use of ***nuclear energy***," said Manfred Petroll of the West German Atomic Forum, an industry-backed lobbying group that promotes the use of ***nuclear*** power.

In Tokyo, the Central Meteorological Agency predicted that contamination soon would drift to Japan, and the government started monitoring radiation levels over 15 cities early Wednesday.

An agency spokesman said weather balloons containing Geiger counters and other instruments to check radioactivity were sent into the higher layers of the atmosphere.

Yasuhiro Nakasone, the prime minister, offered the aid of Japan's science and technology in helping fight the fire at the Chernobyl plant.

Dr. Mostafa K. Tolba, head of the U.N. Environment Program, demanded that the Soviet Union provide all available information on the accident.

"Any country which accidentally spills toxic (materials) across borders to people living downwind should have the responsibility to provide such information," Tolba, an Egyptian, said in a statement issued in Geneva.

"Unsuspecting people, many of them living in countries which have not opted to have their own ***nuclear*** plants, are now wondering if they might become the world's first radiation refugees. They are entitled to know the extent of the invisible dangers they face."

All seven early warning posts run by Switzerland's Federal Commission for Atomic and Chemical Protection were in full operation, but a spokesman said no increase in radiation had been detected.

The Soviet disaster is likely to rekindle the debate over ***nuclear*** power in Switzerland, which gets 39.8 percent of its electrical power from ***nuclear energy***, the fourth highest share in the world behind France, Belgium and Sweden.

A poll taken two years ago, when Switzerland's fifth and most recent ***nuclear*** power plant went on line, indicated only 50.5 percent of the people favored building more plants. An equally narrow majority in a 1979 referendum rejected halting ***nuclear*** projects.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told the House of Commons in London that no increase in radiation had been detected over Britain.

The Foreign Office said it was urgently inquiring about the condition of about 100 British students and teachers in Kiev and in Minsk, which is 300 miles north of Kiev and about 240 miles from the Chernobyl plant.
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''OUR common abode Europe,'' a phrase favored by Mikhail S. Gorbachev when he woos Western Europe, has taken on a frightening actuality in the three weeks since the burning of the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** reactor. The winds, showing no regard for the ideological frontier that sunders Europe, have carried radioactivity and fear to the peoples of the continent, whether allied with or against the Soviet Union.

After Chernobyl, as the Soviet leader conceded in a televised speech last week, the world has changed. ''For the first time ever, we have encountered in reality such a sinister force as ***nuclear energy*** gone out of control,'' Mr. Gorbachev told his people. The speech was a frank admission that a catastrophe had occurred and an effort to push Soviet disarmament proposals, including a ***nuclear*** test-ban accord spurned by the Reagan Administration.

While accusing the West of maliciously exaggerating the disaster, he paid tribute to two American physicians who flew to Moscow to aid radiation-stricken patients by performing bone-marrow transplants. Looking to a global constituency as well as his domestic front, Mr. Gorbachev evidently sought to counter accusations that the Russian passion for secrecy had overcome his vaunted wish for more openness. Deflecting widespread criticism of the Soviet performance, he called for an international early-warning system on ***nuclear*** accidents. Soviet negotiators in Geneva then offered a proposal that codified Mr. Gorbachev's earlier call for the elimination of medium-range ***nuclear*** weapons in Europe.

For those living within range of the fallout - a word that before April 26 had largely been reserved for discussions about an unthinkable ***nuclear*** war - the worst thing was the uncertainty. Should one drink the milk? Eat lettuce? Take off shoes before entering the house? Wash a cat or dog that might have tracked in the invisible poison? Keep the children out of sandboxes and off soccer fields? Shower more frequently? Turn off air conditioners and open windows? Sunbathe on the grass? Both Communist and anti-Communist governments tried to reassure edgy populations that the levels of radiation posed no immediate danger. But what about longer term dangers? Some physicians said that a marginal rise in cancer cases would be expected in the fallout zone.

In crowded Europe, Chernobyl gave a momentous fillip to sentiment against ***nuclear*** power. In the Netherlands, where elections are being held Wednesday, Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers hastily shelved plans for two new reactors, but Chernobyl could deprive his center-right coalition of its majority. In Sweden, popular pressure grew for accelerating existing plans to phase out all ***nuclear*** power by 2010. Austria raised questions about a reprocessing plant being built in nearby Bavaria. Some 100,000 foes of ***nuclear*** power demonstrated in Rome; the Italian Government, sensitized by the Seveso dioxin spill in 1976 and the recent poisoned-wine scandal, has taken measures to ban the sale of leafy vegetables.

Even Communist Hungary, which has an irrepressible environmentalist movement, voiced criticism of the initially secretive Soviet reporting on Chernobyl. Only the French, who depend on ***nuclear*** power for 65 percent of their electricity, maintained their sang-froid. Behaving rather like Moscow, their Government at first tried to hide the fact that radioactive clouds had visited them. In Paris, the newspaper Le Monde noted that, ''while all the Europeans were mobilized to know the truth about Chernobyl, the French silence ended up worrying people.''

In West Germany, Chernobyl began to take on the dimensions of a political calamity for Chancellor Helmut Kohl's beleaguered Christian Democrats. The alarm unleashed by the Soviet accident has roiled the country more than anything since the impassioned debate three years ago over the deployment of American medium-range missiles. ''The issue of ***nuclear energy***,'' explained Walter Tacke of the Emnid polling institute, ''goes to the heart of people's deepest angst. And Chernobyl has touched the population's very sense of existence.''

Anti-Kohl Sentiment

Even prominent Christian Democrats accused the Government of bungling the job of explaining the dangers. The disarray was compounded by a cacaphony of conflicting advice from state governments, which vied with each other to be seen protecting or reassuring constituents. German shoppers spontaneously boycotted fresh vegetables and milk and staged runs on frozen foods, while farmers were forced to plow under unsellable harvests. A poll by the Emnid institute found a dramatic swing in sentiment against ***nuclear*** power - and the Kohl Government. It indicated that the Chancellor's coalition could lose national elections in January to the opposition Social Democrats and the anti-NATO Greens.

While the national elections are more than eight months off, the Christian Democrats and their Free Democratic partners are already locked in a difficult campaign in Lower Saxony, where elections to the state legislature will be held June 15. It has been widely assumed that a defeat for the Christian Democrats in Lower Saxony, where they hold an absolute majority, would open a debate about replacing Mr. Kohl as Chancellor. Increasingly, Christian Democrats are saying in private that Mr. Kohl's leadership style, widely regarded as feckless, is an albatross for the party nationally.

A consensus is building around the view that Chernobyl could cost the Christian Democrats Lower Saxony. The pro-***nuclear*** Free Democrats may not get enough votes to win any seats. The big winners could be the ecology-minded Greens, who are outright opponents of ***nuclear energy***, and the leftist Social Democrats, who are tacking to take advantage of the prevailing antinuclear sentiment. Mr. Kohl, who last week reaffirmed his support for ***nuclear energy*** in the Bundestag, may find himself on the losing side of a hot issue.

As for the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev's speech may have limited some of the damage to Moscow's post-Chernobyl credibility. The slogan launched by the West German Greens - ''Chernobyl is everywhere'' - had resonance elsewhere in Western Europe, where discussion quickly pivoted from Soviet responsibility to the potential threat of any ***nuclear*** plant.

In some ways, the political fallout from Chernobyl may be perversely satisfying to Mr. Gorbachev. In the Netherlands, it bolstered the Labor Party, which wants to undo the decision to station American cruise missiles without waiting for the negotiations at Geneva. And in West Germany it helped the Social Democrats. With the exception of the Bavarian conservative Franz Josef Strauss, no German politician sought to turn the catastrophe into a meditation on the failure of Communism. There have been no anti-Soviet demonstrations. ''But just imagine that it was discovered that there was American uranium that burned up in Chernobyl,'' mused Karl Feldmeyer, a commentator for the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. ''Then we would have plenty of anti-Reagan demonstrations. That is the state of opinion in this country.''

A CONTINENT WONDER WHAT TO DO

For three weeks, as the windborne legacy of Chernobyl drifted across Europe, nations waited and worried. For the most part, the response seemed to depend almost as much on politics as on the levels of radioactivity, which were a fraction of what American experts consider dangerous. The United States Government calls for emergency action if a ***nuclear*** accident is expected cumulatively to expose a community to 5 rems. In Western Europe, countries were recording hourly readings about 2,000 times lower, though in some cases the exposure may have continued for days. In any event, many countries took precautions. A sampling follows:

ITALY: Italy was the first to ban native leafy produce - the ban was later lifted in all but the northeast - and it recommended restrictions on milk consumption by pregnant women and children. In cooperation with the European Community, there were also bans on fruit, vegetables, early potatoes, fresh meat and fish from Eastern Europe.

WEST GERMANY: Some fresh milk and milk products were confiscated, though milk was later declared safe. The public was advised not to consume lettuce and spinach until mid-June. Cistern water for drinking was to be avoided. Some German states closed playgrounds and urged residents not to play tennis or jog.

FRANCE: Until last week, France asserted it had been virtually spared from the fallout, thanks to the prevailing winds. On Tuesday, however, it said a committee would be formed to review all information about the Soviet disaster.

AUSTRIA: Pregnant women, nursing mothers and children were advised to avoid fresh milk and milk products, and there was a general warning about leafy vegetables. For a time, some provinces advised against allowing children to play in sandboxes or on the grass.

BRITAIN: The Mayor of Winsfor in Cheshire banned milk in 13 elementary schools. Radiation levels in Scotland led the Industrial Pollution Inspectorate to warn against drinking rainwater, even though many depend on it.

SWEDEN: Pregnant women and children were advised not to drink fresh milk; in some areas cows were not permitted to graze.

POLAND: Citizens were warned against drinking milk and an official said Poland would accept 50,000 pounds of milk powder offered by the United States Senate. The Government set up a commission to monitor the air; the danger of contamination was greatest near the town of Bialystok, where 3,000 signed a petition against a ***nuclear*** power plant.

**Graphic**

Photo of West German firemen decontaminating car returning from Poland; Photo of Mikhail Gorbachev (AP)
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Hans Blix, director of the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency, left today for Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet government to discuss the disaster at the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** power plant.

Blix was accompanied by two senior experts on ***nuclear*** power, Leonard Konstantinov, deputy director general in charge of the agency's Department of ***Nuclear Energy*** and Safety, and Morris Rosen, director of its Division of ***Nuclear*** Safety.

Konstantinov is a Soviet citizen, Rosen is American.

The invitation from the Soviet government came Sunday, more than a week after the world's worst ***nuclear*** reactor disaster, and it was made clear the Soviets are only seeking to exchange information and are not requesting assistance.

''We have not received any requests for assistance,'' Blix said during a brief meeting with reporters. ''I hope that we will be discussing information matters and also discussing various measures through which ***nuclear*** safety can be increased, in particular through actions within the International Atomic Agency in Vienna.''

The IAEA, an independent body of the United Nations family, is the main world organization dealing with advice on atomic ***energy*** programs. Its recommendations are advisory only.

Blix said several nations of the 112-member agency have complained about the lack of information from the Soviets since the accident.

''The member countries generally feel there is a need for more information, and we shall discuss that,'' he said.

Blix was asked whether he and his associates expect to go to the site in the UKraine of the accident.

''I don't know,'' he said. ''We will have talks with the Soviet government in the first place. That's the main mission.''
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The EEC Commission yesterday launched an attempt to wrest more ***nuclear*** safety powers from national governments, in the wake of the Chernobyl disaster.

The Commission is also to draw up a detailed assessment of the damage done to farmers and others in the EEC by the Chernobyl fallout.

The report was demanded by the European Parliament after a debate on Chernobyl, and will be the basis of a possible compensation claim to the Soviet Union by the Community.

The MEPs backed the Commission's call for greater powers by demanding the adoption of common standards for the design, operation, and safety of ***nuclear*** power stations.

They also called on the Commission and the International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency to organise an international conference before the end of the year, on ***nuclear*** safety and protection.

Mr Stanley Clinton Davis, the EEC Commissioner responsible for the present limited ***nuclear*** safety powers, told Parliament that he would be pressing for new radiation safety standards.

National experts had reported that no revision of existing standards was needed. 'I am not able to agree,' he said. He also revealed that the Commission would no longer accept on trust the radiation information collected by national monitoring agencies.

'I am concerned after the Sellafield incidents, let alone Chernobyl, that these arrangements and practices do not reflect present day requirements. '

The International Atomic ***Energy*** Agency yesterday announced a series of meetings to analyse the Chernobyl disaster. The first meeting, to be hosted by the agency in Vienna on May 20, will bring together experts from the World Health Organisation, the World Meteorological Organisation, the UN Environment Programme, and the OECD's ***Nuclear Energy*** Agency.
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Even before the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** disaster it was probably the case that a substantial majority of rank and file Labour Party members were opposed to atom-generated power. Hostility to the Bomb tends to go with hostility to ***nuclear energy***, even if the correlation is not so complete in the opposite direction.

But if that was the situation before Chernobyl, the Soviet catastrophe has almost certainly doubled and redoubled the hostility, just as it has in the rest of the population. The cautious reaction of Labour's front bench to the events in the Ukraine must therefore be a profound disappointment to many of Mr Kinnock's admirers.

His advisors are well aware of the problem. With the unilateralists clearly in mind, they have produced an intriguing reply to those who express dismay at Labour's failure to seize the propaganda opportunity afforded by Chernobyl.

They point out that, if the next Labour Government really intends to 'decommission' (ie scrap) Polaris then there must be some ***nuclear*** installations where the warheads can be dismantled. Hydrogen bombs, they insist, are not like ordinary high explosive weapons which can simply be let off in a secure place; they have to be carefully taken to bits, and made safe.

So where would this vital task be performed? Why, at Sellafield, of course the very installation whose mere mention makes the anti-***nuclear*** campaigners go pale with fright.

Mind you, those same campaigners are likely to recall that Sellafield also happens to be situated in the Copeland constituency of Dr Jack Cunningham, Labour's shadow environment secretary and the party's chief spokesman on the environmental hazards of ***nuclear*** power.

By pure coincidence, Dr Cunningham happens to support ***nuclear energy***, and argues the case for it with colleagues who would prefer to see the party come out as a radiation free zone. None of these adversaries would dream of accusing him of adjusting his views to suit his 1,837 majority, but they see the coincidence as .. well, shall we say unfortunate?

Which has moved a few of them to express the view that Dr Cunningham's best service to the party might now to be to

Though partially concealed by the drifting cloud of fallout (political and physical) from Chernobyl, the jostling continues in the long queue of ministers hoping to succeed Sir Keith Joseph as Secretary of State for Education.

Peter Walker is still regarded by some very senior Cabinet colleagues as possessing precisely the kind of ***energy*** and experience required to produce the necessary upheaval in the nation's schools. The drawback is that they doubt if Mrs Thatcher could hold her nose long enough to appoint him.

John Moore, the junior Treasury minister, is still well up with the leaders. But Geoffrey Pattie the Minister in charge of information technology, now seems to be attracting the smart money. A question mark hangs over Kenneth Clarke, who has all the robust qualities required but whose sojourn at the Employment Department is perhaps a trifle too brief to justify a move. The same consideration applies to Kenneth Baker, deeply embroiled in matters of ***nuclear*** contamination as well as local government finance.

Now some of the contestants have daringly suggested that Mrs Thatcher should break with custom and conduct a kind of appointments 'board,' at which she and some senior colleagues could interview the applicants one by one.

The security surrounding the government continues to tighten. Mow ministers attending Cabinet committees are barred from entering the Cabinet Office by the street door. Instead, they must go through the police barrier in Downing Street, walk past the wall of Number 10, then plunge into the subterranean world beneath Whitehall - all under the guidance of a uniformed flunky.

It worked well enough for one bevy of ministers on Wednesday, at least on the way in. Unfortunately, no guide had been provided for the return journey. Several familiar figures were later discovered groping their way through ill-lit tunnels, desperately looking for the way out.
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President Aquino's decision to mothball an almost finished ***nuclear*** power reactor in the Philippines in the wake of the Chernobyl disaster is the first blow to the industrial world's ***nuclear*** exporters.

At the moment ***nuclear*** power generates only 4 per cent of the Third World's ***energy*** needs, but it has been growing fast - faster indeed than the rate of expansion of ***nuclear*** power in the developed north, where, where ecology movements and public concern have caused a slight slowdown in recent years.

***Nuclear*** exporters have banked on several factors in persuading Third World governments to buy expensive high technology. One is the governments' hopes of entering the ***nuclear*** weapons club through the door of civilian reactors. The other is the status allegedly offered by possession of ***nuclear*** power.

It is no accident that many governments which have opted for ***nuclear*** power are authoritarian. With the return to some sort of democratic rule their successors have had second thoughts, as in the Philippines, and earlier in Argentina and Brazil when their military regimes came to an end.

Mrs Aquino's objections to the reactor which was being built on the Bataan peninsula are that it would be unsafe and that its cost was outrageously high at dollars 2.11 billions. The US Westinghouse company has acknowledged that it paid an associate of former President Ferdinand Marcos dollars 17 millions for help in securing the contract.

In Brazil a dollars 20 billions programme to develop ***nuclear energy***, originally launched by the military regime, has begun to unravel since the return of the civilians to power last year. Nine power plants were planned by 1990 but only one is in operation and two are being built.

The high cost of the first plant plus the country's growing debt burden have caused second thoughts, as has the giant Itaipu hydroelectric scheme. This promises to produce almost as much power as the planned ***nuclear*** power stations more cheaply and without the environmental dangers.

Argentina's President Raul Alfonsin favours the ***nuclear energy*** programme which his military predecessors put in, but its pace has slowed down. However, the government has negotiated a new credit from West Germany for completing the Atucha II reactor which was being plagued by government budget problems.

Argentina is becoming a ***nuclear*** exporter in its own right. It has plentiful uranium and has mastered ***nuclear*** technology. Chile, Colombia, Peru and Uruguay have received small research reactors from Argentina. It is selling another reactor to Algeria and has agreed to build a power plant for the Chinese. Brazil is not as independent as Argentina since it has chosen enriched uranium to fuel its reactors.

The Third World's biggest operator of ***nuclear*** power is India which already has five small working reactors and five more under construction. It commissioned its first fast-breeder reactor last October, showing that the country had the ability to produce plutonium from domestic technology and fuel. Indian plans to satisfy 10 per cent of its ***energy*** needs from ***nuclear*** power by the end of the century.

Pakistan has also announced that it has the capability of enriching uranium. But it is having trouble keeping its one small reactor working because of unwillingness by Canada to supply parts and technical support as a result of Pakistan's refusal to sign the ***nuclear*** non-proliferation treaty.

The developing country with the heaviest reliance on ***nuclear*** power in Taiwan, which is second only to France in the amount of its ***energy*** generated by it (59 per cent). Even in the oil-rich Middle East governments have been increasingly lured - at least until Chernobyl - by the ***nuclear*** exporters. Iran has a small research reactor, as has Saudi Arabia. Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates have made feasibility studies.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

***Nuclear*** power reactors in Third World countries

-------------------------------------------------------------------

                 in          Under           Total     Approx

             operation    construction        MWE      Annual

                                                     Plutonium

                                                     Production

                                                       (kg)

-------------------------------------------------------------------

              No.  MWE      No    MWE

Argentina    (2)   935     (1)    692        1627      325

Brazil       (1)   626     (2)   2490        3116      625

Cuba

(Soviet

Reactor)                    (1)    408         408      80

India        (5)  1030      (5)   1100        2130     425

Israel

(Research

reactor only)(1)    20                         20     5-10

Mexico                     (2)   1308        1308      260

Pakistan     (1)   125                                  25

Philippines                (1)    621         621      125

South Africa (2)  1842                       1842      370

South Korea  (3)  1789     (6)   5474        7263     1450

Taiwan       (4)  3110     (2)   1814        4924      980

in final planning stage

Egypt             (Considering bids for one or two PWRs each

                   of 1000 MWE at El Dahaa, Alexandra)

Libya              Plans to construct Soviet reactors

MWE - Million watts of electricity

-------------------------------------------------------------------
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***NUCLEAR*** CAPACITY URGED "Defences lowered' \_ Cutler From NEIL EVANS in Sydney Australia should be thinking seriously about developing a ***nuclear*** weapons capacity rather than allowing its defence capability to run down, the former New South Wales Governor, Sir Roden Cutler, believed.

""I don't see any real danger immediately but if we lower the threshold of our defence we are running a great risk," he said from his home in Sydney's eastern suburbs.

QNP

""And I think it has been lowered \_ for instance we are now ordering conventional submarines.

""I think our attitude towards ***nuclear energy*** has got to be changed. We cannot afford to be behind the rest of the world."

Up until last June, Sir Roden was an honorary colonel in two university regiments. Today, he is still an honorary air commodore in the RAAF and retains a keen interest in the country's defence forces.

""Countries can become expansionist. They look on Australia as a place with mineral resources, wide open spaces and so on."

Sir Roden was awarded the Victoria Cross in November 1942 for ""exceptional courage" during action in Syria.

He eventually had his leg amputated after being hit by machine-gun fire.

Sir Roden did not think that if Australia had a ***nuclear*** weapon capacity it would be more likely to be drawn into war. In fact, he thought the reverse might be the case.

""I think ***nuclear*** weapons might come into the category where everyone has got them but they are frightened to use them," he said.

Sir Roden Cutler

**Graphic**

PIC OF HEAD SHOT OF SIR RODEN CUTLER
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President Reagan said Thursday that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev had contacted U.S. officials about the Chernobyl ***nuclear*** plant disaster but that there was no response on an American offer of humanitarian and technical aid.

"We're trying to keep track of what's going on over there but we're limited in our knowledge," the president told reporters.

Asked if Gorbachev had accepted the U.S. offer of assistance, Reagan said, "No. We've heard from him but he apparently had not received our offer yet."

Reagan did not say when or how Gorbachev had been in touch with U.S. officials.

Asked if there had been a second meltdown at the ***nuclear*** power plant, the subject of contradictory intelligence reports in Washington, Reagan replied, "We have no way of knowing."

Word of contact with Gorbachev came as U.S. officials in Washington were complaining that the Soviet Union was not providing enough detail on the power plant accident to allow experts to gauge the health hazard.

Reagan spoke briefly with reporters as he posed for pictures with Indonesian President Suharto at the posh Putri Bali Hotel, next door to the beachfront resort where Reagan is staying.

Suharto, speaking through a translator, told reporters that the Soviet accident might be a topic of discussion at a meeting later Thursday with Reagan and other Southeast Asian leaders.

"It is another proof that although ***nuclear*** power is designed for peaceful purposes, we have to recognize it as dangerous," he said.

Suharto said "the world has a duty" to make ***nuclear energy*** safer.
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