

Nadya Sporysheva from Moskau, Julia Seeleva from Tomsk and Ksenia Srednyak from Volgograd, all Cities are located in Russia, worked on this contribution. Nadya mainly presents the attitude of the Liberal Democratic Party. Julia describes the political conditions in Russia with a priority on the party "Edinaja Rossiya". Be founded on the results of the Russian Public Opinion Research Center, she also presents the public attitude on the nuclear energy. Finally she summarizes the attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church and gives information about the non-governmental organization "Bellona". Ksenia adds information about other non-governmental environmental organizations and describes the discussion in Russia after Fukushima.

Liberal Democratic Party of Russian Federation

LDPR and mainly the leader of this party Vladimir Girinovsky have big influence on people in Russia, mainly teenagers. Girinovsky is a great public speaker, but, unfortunately, not so good expert. A lot of people consider his ideas concerning different questions.



As other parties (except Green party) LDPR has pro-nuclear power stance. Just after the earthquake and nuclear accident in Japan the leader of the party stated that though many European countries just after the accident on the NPP decided not to use nuclear power, but it is not the reason for Russia. There are enough natural resources in Russia to develop this economic sector. Nuclear energy must be the source of income for Russia. Actually it is very popular opinion in Russia. If Russia wants to have profit, it must use nuclear power.

The development of the nuclear power must be carried out with observance of all safety measures. People's lives and health must not be put in jeopardy. For the safety of citizens it is necessary to undertake the whole series of measures: to buy the new, reliable equipment, to choose carefully the area where future NPPs will be located, to inspect all NPPs on time.

Moreover, till the end of this year Russia will formulate the document which is going to define energy safety. Such document will ensure the modernization of the nuclear energy sector.

There is an extract from the official program of the party.

For the successful development of Russian economics the country should encourage the domestic manufacture. This requires implementation of the export programs on the first-priority spheres: aircraft, ship and machinery building, **nuclear energy**, space, manufacture of raw material processing equipment.

To conclude it is an opinion of one of the Russian governmental parties: **government and citizens need money, so we develop nuclear energy.**

And what about the people? What do they think?

On the previous weekend there was a demonstration against nuclear power in Saint-Petersburg. Citizens have expressed the opinion concerning the nuclear policy of Russia: "Harm and danger from use of nuclear power is obvious.

Nowadays, in contemporary conditions, our life is very changeable. All powers of

our world have their own opinion about different aspects of our life. And atomic energy is not exclusion.

Public opinion: Russian Public Opinion Research Center presents the data of quiz of 1600 persons in 153 settlements and 46 regions of Russia.

Questions:-relation to atomic engineering

- relation to development of nuclear power;
- threatens to environment or not;
- probability of "new Chernobyl»
- What kinds of energy must develop most actively in Russia?

More than half of Russians (59 %) consider that it is necessary to develop nuclear power and only 25 % — that it is necessary to turn off it (16 % didn't know what to say). Men expressed in support of nuclear power more often women (66 % and 54 % accordingly), inhabitants of Moscow and Petersburg more often (74 %) inhabitants of other cities (60—64 %) and villages (50 %).

Every second Russian (49 % interrogated) believes that most actively sew that it is necessary to develop for our country new, non-polluting kinds of energy (energy of the sun, a wind, sea inflow) and only 18 % — for priority development of nuclear power (for priority development hydro- and power system accordingly 14 and 8 %). Only 1 % of the interrogated believes that energy should be imported mainly from abroad.

As to «new Chernobyl» 28 % consider quite probable repetition of the accident similar to failure on Chernobyl NPP in 1986; 29 % — probable enough. Only 28 % consider «new Chernobyl» improbable, and only 6 % practically exclude such possibility.

47 % of Russians most dangerous to environment consider transportation and a burial place of a radioactive waste; about 35 % — the industrial enterprises (metallurgical, chemical) and a household waste, dumps, and men specify in the enterprises, and women — on a household waste, cutting down of woods is more often.

Nuclear power stations carry to 29 % of respondents most dangerous to environment; transport (automobile, railway, aviation) — 25 %.

Less often people express alarm in connection with extraction and oil refining (11 %), poaching (9 %), combat material and weapon warehouses (6 %), hydro- and thermal power stations (3 %).

Political parties: In Russian Parliament (State Duma) today present 4 political parties: Edinaja Rossija (United Russia), Communistic party of Russian Federation (CPRF), Liberal-democratic party of Russia (LDPR), Spravedlivaja Rossija (Just Russia).



In program documents we can find only some words about atomic energy and their plans about this.

For example in program document of Edinaja Rossija (United Russia) we read about development of atomic energy , that all problems

in this sphere should be solved, increasing level of salary for workers in this industry and many others. But we can said that Edinaja Rossija (United Russia) is leading party (315 deputies from 350 deputies) that they are for increasing of level energy, which is made on NPP. According to Rosstat (Federal Agency of the state statistics) electric power manufacture by nuclear stations in

2010 in comparison with 2009 has grown on 4,1 % — to 170 mlrd kV.h thermal — on 7,3 % — to

CPRF saying only about historical aspects and of the great meaning, not something special. I want to say some words about opposition party "Jabloko" ("Apple"). They are against atomic energy. They organized pickets and meetings against using atomic energy.

Church opinion: According to information on web-site of Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) they aren't against atomic energy. I made this conclusion from that Leader of ROC take part in a lot of official meetings and their main theme is atomic energy. And so ROC consecrates all plants, all ships, and many others buildings which consists with atomic energy.

Non-governmental organizations:

I think every state has a lot of non-governmental organizations which are against using atomic energy. In Russia situation is the same.



One of the most important among ecological organizations is BELLONA. The Bellona Foundation is an international environmental NGO based in Norway. Founded in 1986 as a direct action protest group, Bellona has become a recognized technology and solution-oriented organization with offices in Oslo, Brussels, Washington

D.C., St. Petersburg and Murmansk. Altogether, some 75 engineers, ecologists, nuclear physicists, economists, lawyers, political scientists and journalists work at Bellona.

Bellona endeavours to identify and implement sustainable solutions to the world's most pressing environmental problems. These include the fight against global climate change, the environmental impact of the oil and gas industry in Europe and Russia and the cleanup after the legacy of the Cold War in Russia.

Ever since Bellona was founded they have been concerned with the enormous environmental challenges in Russia – ranging from the dismantling of nuclear submarines to giving free legal advice on environmental matters. Today Bellona has two offices in Russia. Bellona Murmansk was established in 1994, followed by The Environmental Rights Centre (ERC) Bellona St. Petersburg, in 1998. Bellona Murmansk works primarily with energy issues including monitoring oil and gas developments in the Barents Sea, promoting renewable energy in Northwest Russia, and increasing nuclear safety by advocating solutions for unresolved nuclear waste issues. The ERC Bellona informs and educates citizens in environmental rights, renders legal assistance to victims of environmental abuses, and assists in the development of environmental law in accordance with international standards. The office also organizes courses on environmental journalism. Our efforts in Russia are directed at creating a civil society capable of participating in decision-making. An important precondition for solving environmental problems in Russia is open access to information. The struggle to release environmental information and open closed doors is therefore a priority task for Bellona.

And about nuclear energy they said that nuclear energy is not an alternative Ever since nations began taking greenhouse gases seriously, nuclear power has been discussed as an alternative to conventional fossil fuels. However, given the inherent risks of nuclear accidents and the radioactive waste produced, nuclear energy is not a good solution to our global climate challenges and should not be considered equal to other available, sustainable, and certainly cleaner, renewable energy sources.

Bellona is fundamentally opposed to advancing nuclear energy as a way of reducing greenhouse gasses, and recommends that nations invest in more durable forms of clean

energy that are ultimately cheaper. Considering the prolonged damage to the environment from the nuclear fuel cycle, the heightened risk of nuclear weapons proliferation in unstable regimes, and the unresolved issue of permanent safe storage of nuclear waste, the short term benefits of nuclear power are diminished by the graver environmental and security concerns they raise.

Bellona urges nations relying on nuclear energy, and the officials and corporate interests lobbying for its use, to reconsider their planned investments in the nuclear renaissance and allocate resources for development of ecologically clean renewable energy. In contrast to nuclear energy, renewable energy leaves no environmental footprint, nor does it entail hazardous health costs or security risks to the worlds' citizens for generations.



The world after the Fukushima

My Russian colleague Julia Seeleva has already presented a very good survey of the opinions of Russian political parties and the Orthodox Church. That's why I decided to concentrate on the activity of non-governmental environmental organizations in Russia. But while I was collecting material, the tragic events in Japan happened. As most people all over the world I watched closely the news from Fukushima. It changed my first plan and I came to idea to describe how the Fukushima accident had an influence on the public opinion about nuclear energy in Russia.

On the threshold of the Chernobyl anniversary we would hear that we should remember the lessons of Chernobyl but it is about time to look ahead. In different countries an atomic Renaissance was traced but this week in Japan could stop it.

The official position of Russian government doesn't change much. On 16th of March during the meeting with the Turkish Prime-Minister the President Dmitry Medvedev announced the because of situation in Japan the problem of nuclear energy took on special significance. But, according to his opinion, nuclear energy could be safety if we chose the right place, project and operator. Two days before the Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said that Russia would not change the plans f building new nuclear power plants but "of course, we make conclusions". The official spokesman for "Rosatom" notices that the situation with nuclear energy will change but "we have a deep conviction that there is no alternative to the development of nuclear energy".

The discussion in the Internet is more critical. An oppositional politician Vladimir Milov writes that accidents at nuclear power plants are unpredictable. The specialists in this field try to convince that the probability of nuclear accident is ten in the minus fifth power but the calculus of probability is only a mathematic quantity. A nuclear power plant could be safety for 100 years but if something happens once, it would be more than enough. He insists on a ban on nuclear energy and using water power and gas instead of it.

Another blogger Oleg Kozyrev isn't against nuclear power but he writes that it is impossible to close our eyes further: "Ask yourself one question – are you sure in the safety of our Russian nuclear power plants?" Another blogger Igor Podgorny (an activist of Russian "Greenpeace") pays attention to the Russian plans of erecting of floating nuclear power stations in the Pacific Ocean not far from Kamchatka. These territories are seismic- and tsunami- dangerous.

The opponents of nuclear energy got an indirect support from the "Gazprom". The spokesman of the company mentions that after the catastrophe in Japan the government should revise Russian atomic program. Their argument is that additional precautionary measures make nuclear energy too expensive.

An important indicator of public opinion is the reaction of non-governmental environmental organizations in Russia. After the accident in Fukushima they addressed an open letter to the President Medvedev. It was signed by 74 NGOs ("The Foundation of Ecological Health", "Fenix", "Primorsky Ecological Audit", "The Station of Young Naturalists", "Rostok", etc. - most of them are located in the Far East). The main theses of the letter are:

- Public control of nuclear energy in Russia;
- Regular check-up at the working nuclear power plants, a strict maintenance of safety measures;
- Withdrawal of old reactors;
- A veto upon construction of new nuclear power stations.

It is also remarkable that the authors of the letter referred to Chernobyl. They write that the USA learnt a lesson from the accident at the Three Mile Island in 1979 but the USSR – not: "That experience was failed to take into account in the USSR and as a result in 1986 there was an atomic explosion in Chernobyl".



The question is not in the possibility of the accident in Russia, but in time when it is going to happen. It is high time to develop safe alternative power in Russia, but not to wait for unpredictable accidents.”