

Listen to different people commenting on James Lovelock's current views on nuclear energy.

Optional exercise (The answers are at the bottom of the page).

Listen and decide who makes these points: Michael, Teresa, Kevin, Raymond, Kerry.

Which person thinks...

1. that a lot of scientists don't agree with Lovelock?
 2. that Lovelock has made a turnaround?
 3. that Lovelock now agrees with the government?
 4. that Lovelock's ideas are not really that important?
 5. that nuclear power is not safe?
 6. that people are impatient?
-

Michael: green campaigner

I'm very disappointed with Lovelock's change of ideas. He was somebody who had a lot of interesting ideas about the environment, and I'm sad that he has turned his back on what he said before. There's no way nuclear power is safe – it's just as harmful to the environment as traditional fossil fuels, and as well as that, there's the enormous risk of storing nuclear waste.

Teresa: Member of Parliament

A brave statement from a very interesting man. Our party has always had a strong record on defending the environment, and looking at environmental problems in a constructive way. I'm glad to see that a distinguished scientist agrees with us. We want to build more nuclear power stations, *and* defend the environment – and now we can!

Kevin: biologist

The problem with James Lovelock is that he isn't really a scientist. He has lots of experience in different fields, and I respect him, he's certainly an intelligent man. But a lot of his theories have never really had that much support in the serious scientific community – they've been picked up by lots of other people, Green campaigners and such. I wouldn't listen to him too much.

Raymond: CEO of International Nuclear Fuels

Who? No, I don't think I've ever heard of the man. Who is he? An environmentalist? Oh well, it's always good to have support, from anywhere. And nuclear power is very, very safe. And no, it doesn't pollute at all.

Kerry: member of Surfers for the Environment

People always want quick solutions. As far as the environment goes, there aren't any. It could take hundreds of years to sort out the mess this planet is in. Nuclear power looks like a quick and easy solution, but it isn't. There are levels of radioactivity well above average, and well above safe, in all the sea around nuclear power stations. There are higher rates of cancer and leukemia. Nuclear power is just a way of putting off the damage until a later date.

Answers 1 Kevin, 2 Michael, 3Teresa, 4 Kevin, 5 Michael, Kerry, 6 Kerry