https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

SaND
Safety of Nuclear Waste Disposal
Discussions

‘More Brent Geese than ever are visiting Bradwell’: An examination of the public-facing media messages promoting nuclear energy in the 1950s and 1960s

Wenna Potter[1]
[1]Department of Archaeology, University of York, York, YO1 7EP, United Kingdom

Correspondence to: Wenna Potter (wenna.potter@york.ac.uk)

Part of a PhD project funded from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

Abstract. In the 1950s, rapidly increasing electricity consumption prompted the conception of an ambitious nuclear energy programme in the UK. The need for nuclear was framed alongside continued building of coal and oil power stations, but promoted as a solution to the geographical and supply issues to each respectively. The process of producing electricity from nuclear fission was unknown to many, and information on the development of nuclear energy was largely government and industry led.

This paper draws together official industry media to examine how nuclear energy was promoted to the public. It will argue that aspects of process of generating nuclear electricity were framed as exceptional and mundane to ensure public enthusiasm and support. However, the narrative of the exceptional and mundane was facilitated by the systematic omission of information throughout the dissemination process, to hide elements of contest and gatekeep knowledge in an attempt to maintain the illusion.

1 Introduction

The opening of the first large-scale civil reactors, Bradwell, Essex and Berkeley, Gloucestershire, marked the start of commercial nuclear energy production in the UK, attracting local and national attention. As a new technology, explanations of the scientific process of producing atomic energy were disseminated to the public in the 1950s and 1960s. Emphasis on the remarkability of harnessing the atom, the technological success of nuclear energy, and its potential future contribution was promoted to capture public imagination, fuelling optimism and evoking a sense of national pride. Newsreels followed the construction of early plants, emphasising the scale and size of component parts; a heat exchanger towed through small Essex villages loomed over the surrounding bungalows, as residents left their houses to watch it go by (British Pathé 1959). Atomic power was branded the incomprehensible counterpart to traditional energies, with viewers reminded that *“uranium rods develop heat…, but to all but the scientifically minded, the rest is a mystery”* (British Pathé 1966).

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

However, this was countered with comparisons to traditional coal and oil energy production, emphasising the safety, reliability and necessity of energy production. Within visitor guidebooks, focus was placed on the practical and material parts of nuclear power stations highlighting the engineering basis, rather than the nuclear elements. For example, the continued habitation of Brent Geese at the Bradwell site is emphasised in a visitor guidebook in response to concerns raised at the initial Public Inquiry in 1958, to demonstrate the power station had not negatively impacted on the population of geese (CEGB 1962). The mundane was used to neutralise and offset concern and ideas of risk relating to atomic energy. The selective omission of sections of the nuclear electricity production process, most notably uranium mining and the creation of nuclear waste, raises questions of the intended purpose of the media output.

This paper will deconstruct the narrative of nuclear electricity disseminated to the public by the government-owned Central Electricity Generating Board and the South Scotland Electricity Board to investigate how the mundane and exceptional in nuclear energy were emphasised to mediate public opinion. It will draw on literature surrounding nuclear exceptionalism and banalization to consider the political and commercial uses of information mediation (Hecht 2012; Sastre-Juan and Valentines-Álvarez 2019). It will examine the concept of nuclearity in relation to the portrayal of the electricity generating process to argue that the information was displayed, emphasised, and omitted in order to emphasize the utopian dream of atomic energy.

As the focus is placed on the industry-led narrative, the main archival material used are documents published by the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) and South Scotland Electricity Board (SSEB) for public consumption. A number of guidebooks, published during the construction and early years of operation, were written for the general public and include a baseline explanation of atomic science, the intended nuclear power programme, and a number of sections unique to each site and surrounding area. These provide a fertile opportunity to interpret the industry-led perspective of the role of nuclear energy. Journalistic and popular media, like newspapers, magazines and books, have been excluded from this study as each is inherently reflective of the opinion and political leanings of the individual author, and therefore cannot represent the voice of industry. Although newsreels are journalistic media, they were subject to review by the industry. The focus of the newsreel, and the selection of which areas to include and exclude was dictated by industry permissions, and therefore, given the collaboration required to make the newsreel, the depiction of nuclear energy is in many ways a representation of the industry. On this basis, newsreels will be included in analysis.

The first section will provide a contextual basis for the discussion of the nuclear industry within 1950s and 1960s Britain, outlining the general focus on nuclear weapons, and identifying the critical shift towards establishing and challenging the political basis for heritage-making processes. The next section will argue that the atomic power was marketed by the industry as an esoteric technology to amplify the exceptionality of nuclear technology, inspiring public awe and support. The third section will identify the tactical rationalization of the need for atomic energy, which ties into the mundane energy debates, identifying practical reasons for investment in the development of the new technology. The fourth section will outline key

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

omissions from guidebooks for nuclear power stations to suggest that controversial information was carefully navigated to manage and maintain public support for nuclear energy. The last section will identify instances where nature and landscape have been used to reassure the public, both of the safety of nuclear power and the position of the industry as a caretaker of land. The article will conclude by drawing together the included and omitted narratives from each section to argue that information was curated and controlled to uphold a mystical image of nuclear energy to encourage public support.

2 Background

Significant research has been conducted into ideas of nuclear culture, in relation to both civil and nuclear technology. Efforts to mediate public responses has been established, particularly in response to concerns for nuclear weapons development and use. The idea of banalization of nuclear technology builds off the work of Hecht (2012, 19; 2010, 2) who initiated the discussion of the exceptional and banal in nuclear. Hecht introduces the concept of *nuclearity,* a term coined to discuss the designation of whether or not something is 'nuclear', which she demonstrates has been used subjectively to aid political and commercial motivations (Hecht 2012; 2010). Using the designation of uranium ore as an example, Hecht noted that Iraq was identified as a nuclear state in 2003 due to the import of yellowcake from Niger, but that Niger itself was not deemed nuclear. As such, the concept of nuclearity has held significant political weighting with regard to international relations and perceived proliferation risk, but with large degrees of flexibility and subjectivity (Hecht 2012, 25).

In a special edition of Centaurus (2019) titled *Fun and fear: The banalization of nuclear technologies through display,* Sastre-Juan and Valentines-Álvarez build off the work of Hecht to engage with the idea of banality and nuclear exceptionalism in case study examples from Ukraine, Spain, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. Fun and fear are engaged as prompts to elicit critical analysis of the display practices and cultural interpretations of nuclear technologies to consider local narratives for public emotional mediation (Centaurus 2019). The edition demonstrates that attempts at banalization and the incorporation of fun into nuclear narratives can be seen internationally and across time, with aims of influencing emotional responses. However, Sastre-Juan and Valentines-Álvarez conclude by warning that these historical narratives continue to hold influence and inform discussion in modern debates surrounding all aspects of nuclear technology.

Within the UK context, understanding of British nuclear narratives and the evolution of these has been studied extensively. Langhamer (2019, 209, 220) studied UK emotional responses to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and found that while the development of the atom bomb had been seen as a symbol of future technological hope, many felt anxiety for international diplomacy, the evolution of warfare, and their future safety. A special edition of the British Journal for the History of Science (BJHS 2012) aimed to examine and define 'British nuclear culture', which could work to unite scientific, cultural, and political strands of historical study, with regard to both civil and military aspects (Hogg and Laucht 2012, 479-80). Hogg (2016, 17-8) explores official and unofficial perspectives to consider the social and cultural changes in relation to nuclear

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

technology, often in connection with nuclear anxiety related to weapons development. While some found the development of the atom bomb a symbol of progress for the future which may in turn facilitate greater international diplomacy, many felt anxiety for the evolution of warfare and their future safety (Langhamer 2019, 217, 220).

Boyle (2019) studied the role of the model GLEEP reactor in exhibition displays in the 1940s and 1950s to argue that audience and motivation for display influenced how the model was exhibited to meet the political and commercial needs of the AERE. When exhibited in local communities, efforts were made to banalize the impacts of radiation and emphasise the expertise of the research establishment to develop a sense of safety (Boyle 2019). However, in the context of the national and international exhibitions, scientific skill and innovation were the focus. Boyle (2019) identifies strong commercial motivations and efforts to establish trade routes as a factor which informed display. Industrial and commercial aspects were promoted alongside narratives of safety and expertise, to mitigate concerns for the military uses of nuclear technologies (Boyle 2019). Distinct narratives are identified which were employed to mediate the emotional response of the audience to suit the needs of the AERE. This paper will examine the discussed themes in relation to official portrayals of nuclear energy within the UK.

3 The Mighty Atom

The start of the twentieth century saw extensive and rapid work on the understanding of atomic structure, culminating in the discovery of the splitting of the atom in 1938 (Hill 2016). The use of nuclear fission in the upcoming years was evident, with the development of the atom bomb significantly contributing to the end of the Second World War. The race to develop nuclear weapons had meant that nuclear science had been kept relatively outside the public sphere, allowing little opportunity for the transfer of knowledge (Hogg 2016, 41). The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki drew nuclear weapons into the spotlight and once the United Kingdom had started its own efforts to develop military and civil atomic research, a more concerted effort was made to expand the public understanding of atomic energy and to encourage support for the cutting-edge technology.

The articulation that nuclear things are somewhat out of the ordinary is a narrative precipitated across nuclear discussion, and which provides the groundwork to differentiate and elevate the prestige and optimism attached to nuclear technology, which Hecht terms 'nuclear exceptionalism' (Hecht 2012, 20-1). International political status rested on the possession of nuclear weapons and focus on limitless energy, idealistic futures, technological utopias captured imaginations (Hecht 2012, 21). Nuclear technologies were framed as something separate, innovative and essential. This section will explore how the 'exceptional' of civil nuclear was spotlit to excite and inspire the general public.

Early portrayals of nuclear science emphasised the experimental, but cutting-edge, stage of research. Pitched to the public as 'the mighty atom', the potential capabilities and benefits of military and civil atomic power were emphasised. Nuclear energy was portrayed as a limitless source of electricity, which could provide a plentiful and economic supply to the national grid. In

1945, alongside the development of the weapons programme, hopes were to *"find ways of using atomic energy as a source of heat power for the benefit of mankind"* (British Pathé 1945). The idea of providing 'benefit to mankind' became a dominant narrative, illustrating potential which would be of international gain.

To celebrate the joint opening of Berkeley and Bradwell nuclear power stations in 1962, a celebratory newsreel was filmed. To meet the prestige of opening the first two commercial stations, Prince Philip performed the opening ceremony at Berkeley in person, which was broadcast by television to Bradwell. The process of generating electricity is described as *"How nuclear energy is obtained most grown ups will have to ask their sons, but Prince Philip has enough scientific knowledge to understand for himself"* (British Pathé 1963). Nuclear energy is here portrayed as a complex subject which not everybody would be able to understand. The newsreel provided an extremely limited description of nuclear electricity, including only that *"the heat from the reactor is used to generate steam as coal or oil do in ordinary power stations."* (British Pathé 1963). No mention of nuclear fission is made and there is no explanation of how heat is produced, instead posing the idea that nuclear was incomprehensible to the majority.

The statement "*most grown ups will have to ask their sons*" nods to the modernity of nuclear physics, which by the 1960s had integrated in some form into the school curriculum, but which most adults would not have been taught (British Pathé 1963). Kasperski (2019) examined the modern day portrayal of nuclear power stations in Ukraine through drawing competitions for children hosted by nuclear power plants, which had significant engagement from local communities. While the drawings of the competition offered deep insight into perceptions of nuclear power, possibly more interesting is Kasperski's proposal discussion of tropes and the idea that children are earmarked by the industry as they are believed to be the 'ideal public'. Children are identified as innocent and without the preconceived ideas and opinions typically attached to adult audiences, marking them as an impressionable audience (Kasperski 2019). Drawing on Onion's work (2016) it is also suggested that children play the role of 'ambassadors' sharing their knowledge and enthusiasm with their families and making them ideal advocates for nuclear energy. The focus on the future is evident within nuclear messaging and, as the next generation, their role in shaping the future marks them as important stakeholders.

A similar message is portrayed in the newsreel reporting on the successful generating output of Dungeness A, which commented that *"Uranium rods develop heat in reactors to generate steam for the turbines, but to all but the scientifically minded, the rest is a mystery. The main interest is that it delivers the goods"* (British Pathé 1966). The term 'scientifically minded' feeds into the ongoing rhetoric that nuclear power is somewhat arcane and that it is not necessary for the majority to understand how it works, only that it is highly skilled.

For those looking for further detail of the process of nuclear energy, each industry-produced nuclear power station guidebook included a section, often identical, which explained the process of producing nuclear electricity (CEGB 1965; 1965; 1963). A

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

comparatively small introductory section is given to the process of generating electricity, generally limited to the process of using steam to drive the turbines. For example, this is referred to in the Dungeness guidebook (1965) as *"nearly all of the electricity which the Generating Board produces is generated by turbo-alternators. For these steam is required to drive turbines. Nuclear power stations differ from the conventional installations in that, instead of burning coal or oil, the heat from nuclear energy is used to boil water and generate steam."* A baseline understanding of traditional electricity generation processes was therefore assumed, with the section predominantly focused on the nuclear aspects. Generally this begins: *"to explain what happens in a nuclear power station many words are used which some of us may not fully understand. It is proposed to take such words in a certain order and by carefully defining them to present a fair idea of the general procedure."* (CEGB 1965).

Atomic structure and the fission process are explained, with key words capitalised to demonstrate their significance; these included element, atoms, protons, neutrons, electrons, nucleus, nuclear fission, chain reaction and uranium (CEGB 1965; 1965; 1963). The second part includes a cross-section diagram of a reactor alongside an identification of the key components. Within the discussion of nuclear power, the complex scientific background was portrayed as something which would require a certain level of intellect to understand. The newsreels made very little effort to describe the process of producing nuclear energy, instead playing into an illusion of mystique. The guidebooks made notably more effort, providing the background information required to explain the process, making use of several diagrams illustrating nuclear fission, the process of generating nuclear electricity, and a cutaway of a reactor (CEGB). The omission of a detailed explanation continues to facilitate a narrative of nuclear exceptionalism through the act of simplification and gatekeeping of information. Framing the production of nuclear energy as a deeply complex process reinforces its position as a mystical, elusive and utopian energy, mediating adverse emotions for the benefit of industrial interests.

4 A Rationale for Nuclear

The rationale for nuclear electricity was always paired with comparison to traditionally fuelled power stations, both in logistics and cost. A concerted effort was made to ensure that, while the modernity of technology was highlighted, a reasoned and economic argument was made to support the development of the new method of producing electricity. Focus was placed on the generating potential of each station, to firmly identify its contribution to the National Grid. Initially, the White Paper 'A Programme of Nuclear Power' (1955) was used as the benchmark.

Calder Hall, the first generating nuclear power station, opened in 1956. A year prior, the Programme of Nuclear Power 1955 had outlined the planned development of nuclear energy in the UK, identifying that the first electricity-producing reactors would be built to the design of Calder Hall, with an improved design using enriched uranium expected to be possible six years later (White Paper 1955). While Calder Hall had not yet been completed, confidence in its success had meant that twelve

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

nuclear power stations had been commissioned for intended completion by 1965, with a joint capacity of 1500-2000 megawatts (UKAEA 17).

The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority published a small guidebook on Calder Hall in 1957 to introduce the site, explain how nuclear power was produced and to outline the future nuclear programme. The success of Calder Hall was portrayed as an opportunity and a necessity, as *"The ever-growing demand for electricity, which at present is doubling approximately every ten years, is rapidly out-stripping our resources of conventional fuels, coal and oil. It is for this reason that the need to use nuclear power- atomic energy as it is popularly known- is so urgent"* (UKAEA, 17).

Following the acceptance of contracts for Berkeley, Bradwell and Hunterston in 1956, the nuclear power programme laid out in 1955 was revised in 1957. These three stations were designed to supply 900 megawatts of the 1500-2000 megawatts, showing scope for an increased output of the revised programme. The revised programme laid out plans for nineteen stations to be completed by 1965, with a joint output of 5000-6000 megawatts (UKAEA 17).

The rapid increase in the demand for electricity following WWII was a primary cause for the nuclear energy programme. The CEGB promoted the 'Three Fuel Economy' which identified a combination of coal, oil and nuclear power stations as a method to meet the growing need for electricity (CEGB 1961). In 1963, it was suggested that: *"The electricity supply industry looks forward to a period starting about 1970, in which electricity will be generated from three economically comparable fuels- coal, oil and nuclear power. The electricity supply industry should be able to manoeuvre with reasonable freedom within this "three fuel economy" to choose the proportions of these three fuels in such a way that the minimum cost for electric power is achieved."* (CEGB 1965).

The intention here was to construct three harmonious sectors of the power industry which could react to both changing electricity demand and potential risk to supply of coal and oil. The individual benefits and needs of each fuel source were considered in the siting and type of power station selected.

Coal-fired power stations needed a large supply of coal daily, with plans for the modern designs expected to require 10,000 tons a day (CEGB 1963), which was therefore only feasible in areas located close to coalfields. By the early 1960s, oil-fired power stations were seen as a good option, as oil was more stable, both in supply and cost, as the oil used was the by-product of the heavy oil's industry. However, this was only cost-effective when supplied from UK refineries, and as this supply was finite, the CEGB sought to have alternatives which would not require the import of oil fuels (CEGB 1963). The Suez Crisis in 1956 had also shown the vulnerability of relying on imported fuel (Hill 2013, 222-3).

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

Nuclear power stations were positioned as an alternative which could respond to some of the issues surrounding the required close proximity to coal mines and concerns over the provision of oil. While having a strict siting criteria of their own, the small quantity of fuel needed for nuclear power meant daily transportations would not be needed and therefore, while the number of potential sites was equally limited, these locations were sufficiently different to potential coal and oil-fired power stations to be of benefit. It is worth noting here that no mention is made of hydroelectricity which was a well-established form of generation, most likely because the relative output per station was substantially lower than possible for those in the 'three fuel economy'.

The Central Electricity Generating Board released a series of guidebooks to introduce every Magnox nuclear site before they were completed. These were fronted with an artist's impression of the design and each had a corresponding colour which would follow throughout the booklet, providing the title fonts, backgrounds for diagrams and photograph tints. A map marking the other nuclear power stations (generating or under construction) was included within the opening pages, showing the geographic distribution and the breadth of the programme.

Supplying certain areas of the UK were noted as particularly difficult due to high electricity demand (National Parks Commission 1959-61) the energy deficit in the south of England provides a good example of a situation where local supplies of coal were limited and nuclear (and some oil) power provided a valuable alternative (CEGB 1962). To further illustrate the contribution of nuclear power, the output of each nuclear power station was often related to an area close to each specific power station. This was again often framed within the context of the traditional energies, to further illustrate why nuclear was a suitable and desired alternative. For example, *"Hunterston produces enough electricity to supply a city the size of Edinburgh and it does it at a fuel cost which is far below that of any coal or oil-fired power station built or even contemplated. Its demands on transport and storage for fuel are almost non-existent. There are no railway sidings, no chimneys, no problems of ash disposal. Instead of burning 73,000 tones of coal per month, which would be the case if Hunterston were a coal-fired power station, it uses 10 tonnes of uranium fuel- a single load for a single lorry"* (SSEB 1965).
This provides a tangible and relatable visualisation of the capabilities of nuclear energy which could otherwise be detached from the public understanding. Comparison with coal and oil is again emphasised, mostly related to the heavy infrastructure and high quantities of fuel required to maintain the operation of the power station. Here, the tons of uranium required are directly related to the tons of coal, and illustrated as a 'single load for a single lorry' per month. The logistical benefits are apparent, though there is little-to-no mention of the experimentation and development required for construction of this type.

Some reference is made to the 'clean' nature of nuclear, particularly the absence of chimneys and ash as otherwise inherent in power generation reliant on producing heat by burning fuel. Awareness of the risks of smoke pollution within cities, in part raised by the Great Smog in London (1952) had prompted some concern in relation to power generation (Hill 2016). The consortium responsible for building Berkeley nuclear power station, A.E.I John Thompson, raised the issue of smog in an

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

advertisement promoting Berkeley, stating that: *"It is paradoxical that, in the creation of our industrial wealth, we have choked ourselves with smog. One reason why we need new sources of power is to lessen the grime of our cities. Nuclear energy promises such power"* (A.E.I John Thompson 1958).

Discussion of the reduction of pollution further differentiates nuclear power, framing it as an alternative energy source which could provide a cleaner and streamlined future generation. The positionality of the CEGB, A.E.I and John Thompson Ltd. is of interest, as all three were equally involved in the construction and supply of parts respectively, to coal and oil fired power stations. The promotion of nuclear implies a mindset that while the three fuel economy was then required, nuclear power would shift to the forefront as the technology evolved.

The justification for nuclear energy draws both on the contextual national energy demand and the limitations of traditional power generation. The need for nuclear was identified alongside a logical rationale which highlights the benefits of nuclear power, alongside and in preference to traditionally fuelled plants. However, the limitations of nuclear power are minimally, if at all, acknowledged. The capabilities of uranium are emphasised, while other aspects of nuclear energy draw upon comparison to the mundanity of electricity generation. The selective omission and downplaying of core aspects related to nuclear power are evident, and this will be discussed in the next section.

5 Systematic Omission

Building off the White Paper 1955 and the revision in 1957, the case for nuclear energy is well-argued by the CEGB and SSEB. The logical positioning and identification of the benefits produces a strong argument for investment and development of the new method of electricity production. However, considerably less attention is given to inevitable aspects of nuclear energy which pose or remind of risk. This section will consider information omitted from official industry documents, to consider why this was not acknowledged and how this may have been applied to manage public relations.

As the fuel, uranium was of course featured within the contents of the guidebooks, but this was strictly limited to the processes which occurred within the UK. Uranium is discussed only in relation to the criteria for its selection, which is described as: *"the reason for using natural uranium as a fuel is that it is the only naturally occurring material which can produce a controlled chain reaction."* (CEGB 1962). While uranium is identified as a naturally occurring element, there is no following description of where this naturally occurs or how it was accessed and supplied to the UK. One of the concerns for expanding the scope of oil-fired power stations was based on the potential import of fuel. While the quantities required are vastly different, it is still notable that there is no reference to the import of uranium. Uranium mining was a well-established industry, so it is possible pre-existing knowledge was assumed, but given the level of explanation for other aspects of the nuclear energy process this seems somewhat unlikely.

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

The other reference to uranium is in relation to the supply process to the power station. The guidebook for Hunterston describes the procedure as *"The natural uranium fuel comes to Hunterston fully prepared as fuel elements from the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's factory at Springfields, Lancashire. When an element has served it purpose and is discharged from a reactor it will be stored under water for about 100 days to lose some of its radio-active properties and will then be returned to the U.K.A.E.A's factory at Windscale, Cumberland, where it will be processed to remove still valuable elements."* (SSEB 1965).

Again, this was potentially another opportunity for the mention of the supply chain and processing of nuclear fuel. However, the description of constructing fuel rods is limited to the process which happens within the UK, without any mention of mining and import (CEGB 1965). The UK has not mined uranium; all uranium has been imported from overseas, with fuel for early reactors relying on colonial and commonwealth relations (Hill 2016).

Gabrielle Hecht provides a comprehensive analysis of uranium trade between South Africa and France, with discussion of wider international diplomacy (Hecht 2012). In the UK, official UKAEA historians, Margaret Gowing and Lorna Arnold's books *Britain and Atomic Energy 1939-1945* (1964) and *Independence and Deterrence: Britain and Atomic Energy 1945-1952* (1974) detailed the official development of nuclear technology within the UK, and provide some insight into the trade relations and supply of uranium to the UK. However, Gowing and Arnold's work, while valuable, remains representative of the period in which it was written and lacks a critical account. Written as an official history, it represents an inward-facing institutional perspective which omits the perspectives of others (Gowing 1964; Gowing and Arnold 1974). While political aspects of nuclear power have been further studied since Gowing's work, these continue to lack detailed analysis of the uranium trade associated with British nuclear.

Within the description of nuclear fission and the process of producing nuclear energy, there is no explanation of radiation or the release of fission products. It is limited to an explanation of atomic structure, maintaining a chain reaction and identifying the key components of a reactor. Radiation was only referred to in the guidebooks in relation to protective design features. It is unclear how much the audience would be aware of radiation risk, but given the detail provided on other aspects of the process, the omission of an explanation of the creation and risk of radiation is notable.

While radiation and the associated risks are never explained, references to the precautions and management of radiation are periodically referred to during sections which discuss the detail of design. For example, within the Dungeness guidebook (and similar in others) the role of shielding and layout of the site to minimise radiation exposure was referred to as: *"For convenience in boiler operation all the main feed and steam valves are located beyond the boiler shielding walls. These walls not only*

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

provide shielding for local operation but also reduce the radiation level on site, and in particular near the control room." (CEGB 1965).

The layout of the site and use of shielding were offered as examples of mitigating risk across the site. Continually referring to safety precautions, with the omission of direct reference to risk, illustrates an image of the benign; radiation exists but it is not a threat. This is similarly seen in the discussion of the function of cooling ponds, which states:

"The ancillary buildings attached to the station include a cooling pond in which irradiated fuel elements discharged from the reactor can be stored for months to allow the high intensity radiation to die down before they are transported to the United Kingdom Energy Authority's chemical factory for processing." (CEGB 1962).

The idea that fuel 'can' rather than 'needs' to be stored for prolonged periods in the cooling pond suggests this acts as a preventative safeguard. It is also likely that the difference between 'high intensity radiation' and the radiation level suitable for transport means very little to the reader, given the lack of explanation of radiation. Within the guidebooks, no mention is made of radioactive decay or the half-life of irradiated material. If these guidebooks were your sole introduction to nuclear energy, there is a large side of the scientific background left unexplained.

In terms of safety, each design was a revision of the last, with the gradual evolution of technology to ensure ease of operation and safety of design. Included in a guidebook for Dungeness (1965) was a reference to: *"the revised requirements for limiting the building-up of Wigner energy in the moderator implied a substantial increase in the graphite operating temperature, and the most certain way of meeting these requirements was to increase the gas temperature at the inlet to the reactor."* (CEGB 1965). This section is included within a large section providing more detail on reactor design, which credits adaptations in engineering. No direct reference is made to the Windscale Fire 1957, in which a build up of Wigner energy caused Pile 1 to catch fire and resulted in the UKs worst nuclear accident (Hill 2016). For those with prior knowledge of the Windscale Fire, reference to safety precautions relating to Wigner energy shows acknowledgment of the accident and demonstrates relevant changes have been made to mitigate risk. However, as no direct reference to the accident is made, the recent example of nuclear accident is not revisited, and thus does not raise any further concerns for safety, suggesting careful navigation of the political context.

Wigner energy is also referred to in relation to the design at Hunterston: *"In the Hunterston design each individual fuel element is contained, and separately supported, within a graphite sleeve. This provision gives, among other benefits, automatic protection against the build-up of Wigner energy, a phenomenon which can cause sudden overheating within the reactor."* (SSEB 1965).

Maintaining distance from the Windscale fire, while attempting to draw separation from the accident, may also be an effort to distance the civil nuclear programme from the military. The Windscale piles were known military reactors used for the

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

production of weapons-grade plutonium for the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority. While the civil nuclear programme rested in reactor design developed for producing plutonium for atomic weapons, there was no mention of these origins within the guidebooks.

It is unsurprising that the Windscale Fire and the atomic weapons programme are not referred to, but the distance maintained from both is noticeable. Aspects of nuclear energy generation which may cause concern or justification for criticism were systematically omitted from the guidebook, suggesting intent to produce a favourable perspective on nuclear energy. Elements of the process which could be deemed 'exceptional' or specific to nuclear, such as uranium mining or radiation were positioned alongside practical and safety measures, emphasising the banality and minimising the distinct features of nuclear energy.

6 Flora and Fauna

During the siting process, the impact of large scale industry on the local environment was highlighted as a main concern. The need for rural locations meant the sites selected were often of high value, both in terms of conservation and aesthetics, and with low populations and surrounding industry. Consideration of the aesthetic, or amenity, value of the landscape was a main topic of discussion with extensive investment in landscaping and architectural design of the sites to aid integration of industry into the countryside (Cocroft 2006; Csepley-Knorr 2022; 2021). Kasperski (2019, 60-1) notes the common depiction of nuclear power stations with nature, in part industry-led, suggesting that this offers a sense of familiarity and reassurance, and even frames nature as a mother or protection figure to safeguard local communities.

The disruption caused by construction work and ongoing operation of the site were considered a risk to the continued successful habitation of many types of flora and fauna, often unique to each area. Reference to the natural environment featured in many official publications, sometimes with direct reference to public concerns. For example, the guidebook for Bradwell, published in 1962, concluded by stating: *"At the Ministerial inquiry with the Generating Board's application to build a power station at Bradwell fears were expressed that the Brent Geese which visit that part of England would be disturbed by the building work and disappear. The birds remain unaffected. According to some reports more Brent Geese than ever are visiting Bradwell".* (CEGB 1962).

Brent Geese are migratory, generally travelling from Russia, Siberia, Svalbard and Greenland to winter in the UK from October to March (Wildlife Trust 2025). Those found in the South East of England are generally from Russia and Siberia, distinct by their darker colouring (Wildlife Trust 2025). The population of Brent geese were a main discussion point in the siting of Bradwell due to their protected status, and the risk to their habitat and food supply which the construction and operation of Bradwell may cause. In the Inquiry, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds had highlighted the significance of the Dengie Peninsula and the Blackwater Estuary as an area for the habitation of a significant number of Brent geese.

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

By acknowledging the previous concerns of the public inquiry, the CEGB provided the opportunity to address potential criticism and provide reassurance to the public regarding the impact of the new nuclear power station. It is unclear what information had informed this statement as no evidence was provided making it impossible to directly trace the source.

Reassurances for the Brent Geese may also appear premature, as the guidebook in question was published when Bradwell was still under construction. At the Bradwell Inquiry, while some concerns for the geese were focused on disruption during the period of construction, these were more heavily focused on the impact of warm effluent on food supplies which would not have affected the wellbeing of the geese until after operation had begun (Grimmitt 1956). However, the hasty reassurances of the CEGB show a desire to demonstrate harmonious co-habitation of industry and nature in an effort to neutralise public concerns. The inclusion of nature goes beyond showing care for the environment, by referring to the continued normality for the area.

A similar sentiment is demonstrated in relation to Dungeness, located on a depositional shingle spit which meant the land has become gradually more exposed over time as sediment had built up. This allowed a microhabitat to evolve which did not include invasive and dominant species, and supported the survival of a number of rare plants and insects (Nature Conservancy 1958). An extensive reference to this is made within the Dungeness guidebook 1965, stating that:

"Dungeness is a unique shingle depositional feature and has many unusual mosses, lichens and other plants and also has several rare insect colonies, apart from which it is one of the major crossroads of bird migration routes. The area has considerable interest for naturalists and physiographists and special measures were taken by the Board to minimise any disturbance to the natural life and surface features. In conjunction with the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, a local warden was appointed to protect these interests and close liaison with the Board's resident engineer established even before any construction work started." (CEGB 1965).

The efforts made by the CEGB to ensure minimal disruption show an awareness and appreciation of the unique value of the land, and its inclusion in the guidebook emphasises this care to the public. Here the industry is portrayed almost as a custodian of the land, working collaboratively to protect the landscape, alongside meeting increasing energy demand. Kasperski (2019, 60-1) notes the frequent industry-led depiction of NPPs entwined with nature and suggests that this is often mirrored in children's artistic imaginings of NPPs. Kasperski proposes that industry encourage this narrative as it offers a sense of familiarity and reassurance, and even frames nature as a mothering or protection figure to safeguard local communities. The value of nature to offer reassurances for nuclear energy has been frequently used across nuclear publications, demonstrating the interconnectedness between nuclear sites and their landscapes.

Similarly, a new lighthouse was built in Dungeness (1961) as the previous version would be eclipsed by the power station. This was portrayed as an investment in the area and community, with the switch to an automated system emphasised as a shift

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.
SaND Safety of Nuclear Waste Disposal Discussions

towards 'progress'. Trinity House, a charity attached to the General Lighthouse Authority, reported that the lighthouse has been spotlit since 1962 which has reduced the high mortality rate of migratory birds (Trinity House 2025). Although this decision was made prior to the release of the guidebook, no reference is made to this incident, despite the fact that efforts were made to prevent continuing bird death. This reinforces the narrative that information which could be taken and critiqued was omitted from inclusion, rather than acknowledged.

The strict siting criteria meant many nuclear power stations were built in sensitive locations, and meant extensive architectural and landscaping treatment was applied to mitigate risk to the amenity value of land. Efforts made to integrate the power station with the land to cause minimal disruption were frequently reported on in the guidebooks. For example:
"Opinion was tested in a lengthy public inquiry in the course of which it was agreed on all sides that the amenity of Hunterston, both public and private, was of very great value and merited the most anxious consideration…Today's buildings are indeed very fine. Despite their size they blend with their magnificent surroundings like a sundial in a country garden. On this world-famous stretch of the Clyde they have become something of a tourist attraction." (SSEB 1965).

While emphasising the serious consideration given to concerns raised at the public inquiry, the guidebook suggests that, if anything, the power station had added value to the area. Hunterston is almost compared to the 'world famous stretch of the Clyde', with the power station viewed as the tourist attraction over the natural beauty of the area, suggesting that mankind had built something which rivalled nature. This idea draws back to initial ideas of 'harnessing the atom' which dominated the 1950s and 1960s, a technological era of atomic power and the race for space. Nuclear energy is placed on a pedestal to be marvelled at, but never quite understood.

7 Conclusion

In conclusion, the official media released to the public by or with consent of the industry depicted a hopeful future for energy security within the UK provided by nuclear power. While the benefits of atomic energy were explained, the process of generating electricity was framed as a complex and scientific process, intended to evoke a sense of awe, drawing on similar examples of nuclear exceptionalism seen internationally. Aimed at a wider public audience, the newsreels made little effort to explain the process of generating nuclear energy, instead emphasising the exceptionality and incomprehensibility of the industry. Aimed at the reader who wanted a little more information, the guidebooks provide an accessible introduction to nuclear electricity generation, though omit several undeniably important aspects relating to the process, like uranium mining and the production of radiation.

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

Issues such as these were carefully mediated to provide sufficient information for those without preexisting knowledge, but not enough to offer easy criticism of the industry. Radiation is downplayed as a banal side-effect of producing nuclear energy, discussed only in relation to design, in which both the efficiency of technology and safety were mentioned as adjacent. The omission of discussion of risk banalizes nuclear technology, removing discussion of the clearly nuclear aspects, here highlighting how nuclearity is managed in a subjective manner.

Similarly, regular inclusions regarding the protection of nature position the industry as careful custodians of the land, responsive to the concerns of the public, as evidenced by their care for wildlife and aesthetics. Reference to nature leans into an appreciated, understood, and domestic normality, with the continued habitation of bird and plant life acting as reassurance for their health, but also for the safety for humans. The success of wildlife inherently draws parallel conclusions without requiring discussion of radiation and risk to human health.

This paper offers a look into the methods and materials used to publicise the very first nuclear power stations as examples of the latest technological innovation, which offers a case study examination of a formative portrayal of nuclear energy to the public. Unsurprisingly, the depiction of nuclear energy was overwhelmingly positive and rationalized. Threading throughout is a narrative of omission, of oversimplification, and mediation. Attitudes towards nuclear technology have naturally evolved since these publications, responding to key nuclear events, and wider cultural, economic, and political shifts and with widening media outlets.

References

A.E.I. John Thompson Ltd.: Power to cleanse our cities, British Nuclear Energy Conference Proceedings, 1958.

Boyle, A.: "Banishing the atom pile bogy": Exhibiting Britain's first nuclear reactor, Centaurus, 61, 14-32, https://doi.org/10.1111/1600-0498.12220, 2019.

British Pathé: The Might Atom, British Pathé, https://www.britishpathe.com/asset/67564/ (last accessed 28 August 2025), 1945.

British Pathé: Reactor on Tow, British Pathé, https://www.britishpathe.com/asset/190385/ (last accessed 28 August 2025), 1959.

British Pathé: Power Accepts Challenge, British Pathé , https://www.britishpathe.com/asset/87110/ (last accessed 28 August 2025), 1966.

British Pathé: Duke Lauds Atom Power, British Pathé, https://www.britishpathe.com/asset/86554/ (last accessed 28th August 2015), 1963.

British Pathé: Girder Towed 200 Miles, British Pathé, https://www.britishpathe.com/asset/187732/ (last accessed 28th August 2015), 1958.

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

Csepely-Knorr, L.: "Conditions in Landscape Which the Public as a Whole Wishes to See and Enjoy" – Electricity Generation, Amenity and Welfare in Post-war Britain, Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography, 104:3, 192–208, https://doi.org/10.1080/04353684.2022.2065646, 2022.

Csepely-Knorr, L.: Landscape in the Making: How the Nuclear Landscape Empowered the Profession, The Journal of the Landscape Institute 3 18-21, ISSN 1742-2914, 2021.

Central Electricity Generating Board: Trawsfynydd Power Station, Regional Secretary's Division North Western, 1965.

Central Electricity Generating Board: Dungeness Nuclear Power Station, Central Electricity Generating Board, 1965.

Central Electricity Generating Board: Sizewell Nuclear Power Station, Southern Press, 1963

Central Electricity Generating Board: Berkeley and Bradwell Nuclear Power Stations, Central Electricity Generating Board, 1962.

Central Electricity Generating Board: Bradwell Nuclear Station, P.C. Printing and Publicity Ltd. No. 176, 1962.

Central Electricity Generating Board: Trawsfynydd Nuclear Power Station, Central Electricity Generating Board, 1961.

Cocroft, Wayne. 'England's Atomic Age: Strategy on the Historic Industrial Environment Report' *Historic England* 3 (2006), 1-66.

Electricity Act 1957, c.20. London: The Stationery Office.

Gowing, M.: Britain and Atomic Energy, 1939-1945, London, Macmillan, 1964.

Gowing, M, Arnold, L.: Independence and Deterrence: Britain and Atomic Energy, 1945-1952, London, Macmillan,1974.

Grimmitt, H.W.: Report of a Public Inquiry into the Application of the Central Electricity Authority to establish a Nuclear Power Station at Bradwell in the County of Essex, The National Archives, Kew, POWE 14/1502, 1956.

Hecht, G.: Being Nuclear: Africans and the Global Uranium Trade, MIT Press, Massachusetts https://doi.org/10.1086/670902, 2012.

Hecht, G.: The Power of Nuclear Things, Technology and Culture, 51, 1-30, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40646990, 2010.

Hill, C.: An Atomic Empire: A Technical History of the Rise and Fall of the British Atomic Energy Programme, Imperial College Press, London, 2013.

Hinton, C., Holford, W.: Preserving Amenities: Power Production and Transmission in the Countryside, The Churchill Archives, Cambridge GBR/0014/HINT/1/2, 1960.

Hogg, J.: British Nuclear Culture: Official and Unofficial Narratives of the Long 20th Century, Bloomsbury, 2016.

https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-2025-6
Preprint. Discussion started: 12 September 2025
© Author(s) 2025. CC BY 4.0 License.

Hogg, J., Laucht, C.: Introduction: British nuclear culture, The British Journal for the History of Science 45:4, https://www.jstor.org/stable/4109786, 2012.

Kasperski, T.: Children, nation and reactors: Imagining and promoting nuclear power in contemporary Ukraine, Centaurus, 61, 51-69, https://doi.org/10.1111/1600-0498.12226, 2019.

Langhamer, C.: Mass Observing the atom bomb: the emotional politics of August 1945, Contemporary British History, 33:2, 479-493, https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2018.1519422, 2019.

Ministry of Fuel and Power: (1955) *A Programme of Nuclear Power*. Cabinet Minutes CAB/129/73/3. The National Archives, London.

Sastre-Juan J, Valentines-Álvarez J.: Fun and fear: The banalization of nuclear technologies through display, Centaurus, 61, 2–13, https://doi.org/10.1111/1600-0498.12223, 2019.

South of Scotland Electricity Board: Hunterston Nuclear Generating Station, South of Scotland Electricity Board, 1965.

United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority: Calder Hall, Industrial Group United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, 1957.

The Nature Conservancy: Evidence of the Nature Conservancy For the Public Inquiry into the Proposed Nuclear Power Station at Dungeness, Kent, to be held at Lydd, New Romney, Kent, on the 16th December 1958, The Chiswick Press, London, 1958.

The Wildlife Trusts: Brent Goose, https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/wildlife-explorer/birds/waterfowl/brent-goose, last accessed: 30th August 2025.

Trinity House: Dungeness Lighthouse, https://www.trinityhouse.co.uk/lighthouses-and-lightvessels/dungeness-lighthouse, last accessed: 30th August 2025.

Wall, C.: "Nuclear prospects": The Siting and Construction of Sizewell A Power Station 1957-1966, Contemporary British History, 33:2, 246–273, https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2018.1519424, 2019.