

# Accepted Manuscript

Review Article

Nuclear Energy: Sense or Nonsense for Environmental Challenges

Rokhshad Hejazi

PII: S2212-6090(16)30024-3

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.07.006>

Reference: IJSBE 181

To appear in: *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*

Received Date: 18 February 2016

Revised Date: 10 April 2017

Accepted Date: 1 July 2017

Please cite this article as: R. Hejazi, Nuclear Energy: Sense or Nonsense for Environmental Challenges, *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment* (2017), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.07.006>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



**Title****Nuclear Energy: Sense or Nonsense for Environmental Challenges****By****Rokhshad Hejazi: Faculty Member of Islamic Azad University North Tehran Branch,  
Environment Department****Abstract**

Environment is subject to many pressures. Climate change and the global warming constitute an additional pressure. The “climate change” and its consequences are more important than other challenges in 21 century. The global temperature rises of greater than 2.5°C in recent years. Similarly, a global temperature rises of greater than 2.5°C increases by 80 million the absolute number of people at risk of hunger. Recent estimates indicate that 25% of the world’s mammals and 12% of birds are at significant risk of global extinction. The main reason of global warming is CO<sub>2</sub> increasing that obtain from burn reaction. according to California university, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is a result of: transportation49%, elctricity30%, industrial11%, residential 7% and commercial 3%.in the mean time, CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is 360 ppm even, if severity plan will be applied by Kyoto protocol it will arrive to 450-650 ppm in 2100. Thus, there is a global resolution for declining CO<sub>2</sub> emission and one of the practical approaches is CO<sub>2</sub> decreasing in electricity sector. Each of energies has strengths and weaknesses and we more focus on nuclear energy because its CO<sub>2</sub> emission is zero. It should be add, in most of countries there is a tax for gas e.g. in the U.K 3.4\$/gallon and in Italy 2.53 \$/gallon, so fossil fuel is an income for their governments but for nuclear energy government pay subsidies. Therefore it is not possible to debate about it before disappear tax and subsidy. In recent years, it has stated some opinions about tax on carbon production that is a step forward to low carbon economic and finding really cost of fossil fuel with attention to external costs in the environment.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6659520>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6659520>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)