



## Resolution

### Nuclear energy

As conservatives and Christian democrats, we have an obligation to future generations. Today the world environment suffers from the excessive use of fossil fuels as our main energy means, but the environmental pollution will become an even bigger problem for future generations. Therefore we need to look at other opportunities in energy production, one of which is nuclear energy.

To fulfil the Kyoto-protocol which concerns the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions, the countries in the European Union must take new measures. Nuclear energy has no direct carbon dioxide emissions, and would therefore be a possible way to fulfil the protocol.

It is also possible to substitute fossil fuels with alternative energy sources like wind, water and solar energy, generally referred to as renewable energies, but there are several problems following the use of these energy sources. From an economic point of view, alternative energy is more expensive than other energy forms; therefore it would be difficult today to fulfil the Kyoto-protocol with alternative energy due to the associated costs. Another problem with alternative energy is stability. Due to unpredictable wind and sun, the energy supply from these sources is highly unstable.

But the endorsement of nuclear energy by European countries should not be seen as a replacement for, investments in the further development of alternative, renewable sources of energy. Research in renewable sources of energy should be continued and increased (to meet the commitments to increase the rate of renewable sources to 12% by 2010) By contrast, the different sources of energy should be viewed as complementing each other, rather than interchangeable; forming part of a broad strategy to reduce dependency upon carbon dioxide-yielding sources of energy.

To limit the emission of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, concrete methods are needed to produce energy, but also to save it. Nuclear power is the most efficient way to produce this mass energy, with consideration of the environment. It is possible to gather and contain the waste from nuclear power plants; thereby

making sure it does not create an impact on the environment. Storing nuclear waste is not ideal, but it is preferable to the emissions generated in fossil energy production. One should also bear in mind, that the filters used in coal power plants are so poisonous and radioactive, that the only way to store them safely is by burial.

Even though nuclear energy is one of the cheapest and cleanest forms of energy production, public opinion is often very sceptical about it. One of the reasons for this is the fear of accidents, like the ones in Chernobyl, or Three Miles Island. To balance the populations' fears toward unsafe plants, we should encourage them to be replaced. They are a great risk, mainly for the surrounding populations and, even for neighbouring European countries. Any operational irregularities would discredit the entire industry, also including those very safe and productive nuclear plants which conform to international standards. This policy should therefore be coupled with an information campaign for citizens, informing them on the choices we made, the consequent risks of opting for nuclear power and the comparisons with other energy supplies.

Western nuclear power plants are so robust that a plane can crash into them and leave the core intact. Should all the security measures fail, which is highly unlikely, the walls of the plant are strong enough that they will contain all radioactive material in case of a meltdown.

The question of using nuclear power is also one of European security and independence. A rise in the use of nuclear power in Europe would increase Europe's independence in its energy supply.

Nuclear power is one of the key issues of European security and independence. At the moment most of gas and oil supply comes from semi-democratic or non-democratic regimes outside Euro-Atlantic space. A rise in the use of nuclear power in Europe would increase Europe's independence in its energy supply, thus making it possible to foster democratic reforms in the countries that export energy resources.

To secure continuous energy provision at an affordable price for everybody, a mix of nuclear energy and other energy sources is necessary.

Nonetheless, securing European supply in energy should not prevent us from saving part of the energy we use and waste. Therefore, promoting the various ways of saving energy (and so, fossil fuels) is also a key direction the European Union should provide to customers, informing them with the various ways to save their own money via wasting less energy.

Nuclear energy is not the perfect solution for the energy production in the future, but it is undoubtedly the most efficient method available today. Nuclear energy is required if the countries of Europe are willing to fulfil the Kyoto-protocol. Regarding this goal, new generation plants are going to be even better and more efficient. The huge hope nuclear fusion brings calls for a massive support of the various research programmes going this way. This new technology makes nuclear power much more efficient and creates a much lower quantity of nuclear waste, thus allaying much of the scepticism associated with nuclear power.

Therefore YEPP supports nuclear energy, and the possibility for all European countries to use nuclear energy. It's a question for each nation to decide and carry out, but the European Union must help to restart the debate and maintain researching in nuclear energy

*Adopted at the YEPP Council, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 20 January 2007*