# THE MYTHS OF NUCLEAR POWER or

why nuclear power is no future option for Serbia (or any other country)

Ir. Jan Haverkamp jan.haverkamp@greenpeace.org
g expert consultant nuclear energy





GREENPEACE





GREENPEACE



GREENPEACE





# Is nuclear a good option to replace lignite in Serbia? Belgrade May 17, 2016

Steve Thomas (stephen.thomas@gre.ac.uk)

Emeritus Professor of Energy Policy

PSIRU (www.psiru.org), Business School

University of Greenwich



#### **Nuclear construction**

#### China, Russia, South Korea, India

#### **Europe:**

- Olkiluoto 3, Finland
- Flamanville, France
- Mochovce 3,4 (early 2<sup>nd</sup> generation), Slovakia
- Astravetz, Belarus

## **Under preparation**

- Hinkley Point C, UK
- Hanhikivi, Finland
- Paks II, Hungary



## **REALITY:**

Nuclear energy is too risky to gamble upon

Nuclear energy is too expensive to matter

Nuclear energy is a 20st century energy source on its way out







#### The debate

#### Chernobyl

- 28, 32, 37, 39, 42, 57 deaths?
- 4000 deaths?
- 9600 deaths?
- between 10 000 and 200 000 deaths realistic numbers around 40 000 (TORCH-2016) and 90 000 (Greenpeace 2005)

#### **Fukushima**

- nobody died?
- no health effects?
- currently increase in thyroid cancer; total radiation induced casualties in hundreds to thousands; already over 2000 nonradiation deaths

