

The WHO/IAEA – Unholy Alliance and its Lies about Int'l Nuclear Health Stats

Interview with Alison Katz on Nuclear Hotseat



Libbey HaLevy vor dem Reaktor in Three Mile Island am 10. April 1979 während aus diesem immer noch Radioaktivität austritt. Foto: <http://www.nuclearhotseat.com/sample-page/>

Libbey HaLevy: Welcome to Nuclear Hotseat, the weekly international news magazine keeping you up-to-date on all things anti-nuclear. My name is Libbey HaLevy. I'm the producer and host as well as a survivor of the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island from just one mile away. So I know what it looks like when the nuclear experts get it wrong.

Today is Tuesday September 17, 2013 and this is a special edition of Nuclear Hotseat. The first of two on the unholy alliance between the World Health Organization and the pro-nuclear International Atomic Energy Agency.

Alison Katz – today's interviewee – is a sociologist and psychologist who worked inside the WHO for 18 years, now a leader within Independent WHO, an organization she will explain.

Alison dissects the history, politics and manipulations of the UN-agency we are supposed to be able to trust to safeguard the world's health, especially in nuclear matters. This is a Nuclear Hotseat exclusive.

01:02

Talk to us about [IndependentWHO](#), health and nuclear power.

Alison Katz: First let's explain what the name means. We are asking for the independence of the World Health Organization that is what is WHO. And the World Health Organization is a Specialized Agency of the United Nations.

The health consequences of nuclear activities, whether they are civil or military, are not known to the public. So we are talking about things like the accidents of Chernobyl, even Three Mile Island and of course Fukushima now. And there has been a very high level, institutional and international cover up, which includes governments, national authorities, but also, regrettably, the World Health Organization itself.



As our name IndependentWHO suggests, we demand the complete independence of the WHO from the nuclear lobby and in particular from its mouthpiece, which is the International Atomic Energy Agency. We are demanding that independence so that the WHO may fulfill its constitutional mandate in the area of radiation and health.

We are absolutely convinced that if the health and environmental consequences of all nuclear activities were known to the public, the debate about nuclear power would end tomorrow. In fact the public would probably exclude it immediately as an energy option.

So what really is our gripe with the WHO: The WHO provides and has done for 50 years really now *a clean bill of health* for nuclear activities.

Our angle is really public health. We want people to understand that this *clean bill of health* is not based on serious, independent science. In fact it is based on a very crude, pseudoscience, largely controlled and directed by the nuclear lobby.

02:59

How does this nuclear lobby – meaning the International Atomic Energy Agency – prevent the World Health Organization from telling the truth about nuclear power?

First of all the IAEA, so the International Atomic Energy Agency, is only part of the nuclear lobby, it's actually only his mouthpiece, it's not the most important part – we will talk about that in a minute.

The WHO in practice, in reality, is subservient to the IAEA within the hierarchy of the United Nations Family.

And the IAEA reports to the Security Council which – as you probably know – consists of the most powerful nations on Earth. With the veto power of these powerful nations, the Security Council is really the top of the power hierarchy.

The World Health Organization itself is very much lower in the hierarchy and only reports to the Economic and Social Council. And that has very little geopolitical power.

I think it might be important to have a little look at the respective mandates of these two United Nations Agencies.

And I'll quickly start with the IAEA: There are two mandates, one of them is to prevent proliferation of nuclear power (*corrected in transcript to nuclear weapons*) and that of course is a very laudable objective. But the other part of the IAEA-mandate is very problematic indeed, it is the promotion of the use of the atom, peaceful use of the atom, but nevertheless it is promotion of the use of the atom. In that way it is actually an industrial or a commercial lobby. And yet the IAEA is responsible and controls the WHO in everything that concerns health consequences of nuclear activities. That means that what we are looking at is a conflict of interest. The IAEA in a nutshell is judge and jury (*corrected in transcript to judge and party*) in its own industrial activities and in the safety of those industrial activities.

Let's have a quick look now at the WHO's mandate: The World Health Organization is the leading and coordinating authority in the world on all health matters, including radiation and health. It sets norms and standards, it coordinates research, it does a lot of work on statistics, in epidemiology, it

advises member states and it coordinates research and so on and formulates health policy. So, the WHO should have the competence as regards health consequences of nuclear activities.

The IAEA has neither competence nor mandate in this area and yet it is the IAEA that is deciding on health policy in the place of WHO. In fact it simply dictates this health policy to WHO and it has done for the past 50 years.

The source of all of this is an agreement that was signed in 1959, an agreement between the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Health Organization. And basically what happens in practice is that the WHO cannot undertake any research, cannot disseminate any information, cannot come to the assistance of any population without the prior approval of the IAEA. So really it does not fulfill its mandate at all and it does not fulfill its mandate in an independent way. And we are seeking its independence so that it can fulfill its constitutional mandate in the area of radiation and health.

06:32

This is almost painful to hear because whenever an international incident happens, a nuclear accident, WHO's statistics and reports are the first to be referenced by mainstream media and used to reassure the public that there is no danger and yet it is very clear from what you are saying that the statistics that they are coming up with in the reports, they are coming up with, are not honest to the existing science. Yet they are seen as the ultimate experts.

They are indeed and you have made a very, very important point there, it's very important for us, strategies in our movement of IndependentWHO, precisely because the world's people have faith in WHO, as indeed they should, if WHO was fulfilling its mandate. The trouble is that WHO is very influenced by all of kinds of outside bodies. But we will talk about that in a minute.

Because it is considerable obstacle that people have faith in WHO we do need to produce the evidence that they have been heavily influenced, in fact they are directed and controlled in this particular area by the IAEA.

So let me give you a few examples of this evidence:

After the Chernobyl accident the World Health Organization was absent from Chernobyl for 5 whole years. Now this is really an aberration because part of WHO's mandate is to be there the day after a catastrophe. It would send a team in the days that follow a catastrophe in order to evaluate the exact nature of the crisis and so on and to provide assistance. WHO was not there for 5 whole years – that's one thing.

Now here is an interesting thing: In 1990 the USSR, as it was at the time, made a request to the World Health Organization. It was a request to develop a research project for them. It was not the WHO that replied, it was the IAEA. And the IAEA indeed designed the research project and it did something absolutely extraordinary to anybody who knows just a little bit about radiation and its dangers. It omitted from its research project, genetic effects, and it made dental caries a priority.

08:49

That makes absolutely no sense.

No sense whatsoever. It is almost laughable. Now another piece of evidence is that there are no independent reports being issued by WHO. They are all identical to IAEA-reports or they are simply written by the IAEA and then published in the name of WHO.

Here is another very important piece of evidence. There were two very important international conferences on Chernobyl, one held in Geneva in 1995 and one in Kiev in 2001. The proceedings of these conferences – proceedings is just the final report – were never published. And WHO has lied about this until extremely recently, they have insisted even to journalists of very major newspapers that these proceedings, these reports, were published. Now they simply were not and WHO cannot produce them. Another interesting example of how we know that the WHO simply has not been taking its responsibilities – one of its former Director Generals, it was Dr. Nakajima, this was the Japanese Director General who was for 8 years the head of WHO, he actually very candidly explained that the reason why the two reports haven't been published was because of the legal constraints that the agreement with the IAEA of 1959 puts on WHO – he actually stated this openly in an interview on Swiss-Italian Television. So in another words, he was recognizing this subordination. That is an extraordinary admission from someone who was a former Director General. Even that is denied by the World Health Organization today which is a little bit ridiculous because of course this testimony is on film. Anybody can consult it.

10:36

So it seems that as regards nuclear radiation and health the world's people have no competent authority to turn to, in this critically important area of public health?

I have to say that unfortunately that is indeed the situation. People have no national or international authority to turn to. There are independent scientists and there is a huge amount of information.

What the public also needs to know is that today the WHO has absolutely no competence in this critically important public health area, which is radiation and health.

There used to be a Department of Radiation and Health at WHO, at least at headquarters. And it was closed about two, three years ago. Even when it existed, it was not ideal. There were three units and they are all very interesting. One of them was on mobile telephones, one on electromagnetic fields, and the other on nuclear power. Now all three of these units were highly compromised and there was a director, a Dr. Repacholi, who had been recruited from industry and he worked as director in WHO for 10 years and then left to go back to industry at the end of it. And so we have a classic example of the *revolving door*, which of course is also a part of conflict of interest.

Apparently scientists did complain to WHO about Dr. Rapacholi. About 2.000, 3.000 scientists signed a letter of complaint, because he was accused of withholding essential evidence on depleted uranium. Unfortunately this accusation never came to anything, but it's a reflection of

the power of the nuclear lobby. Rapacholi has gone, the Department of RAD has closed and has not been reestablished. It was one of the questions that we asked the current Director General – which we will talk about in a minute.

So the situation today in WHO is, that there is no senior radiation scientist or radio-biologist. And it is very, very important that the world's people do know that at this moment there is no international authority in this area. It's quite useful to note that WHO does not actually deny these things.

Maria Neira, who is the Director of a department that's called Public Health and Environment in WHO, did very candidly state to the newspaper Le Monde, which is the major French newspaper, that WHO gets all its information from the IAEA.

13:09

It's clear that WHO has no competence in the area of nuclear radiation. And that alone is a pretty shocking. But what about other authorities and institutions in the world? There must be some competence somewhere?

Yes, there certainly is, there are independent scientists carrying out medical and scientific research and this is indeed the only source of reliable information. But as you can imagine they face enormous obstacles, you know with funding cut off, research not published. There is control of academic and research institutes by the lobby etc. And that's why one of our aims is to bring together citizens and independent scientists. Because – it's terrible to say so – but we can't rely on our own authorities and public institutions. And that is a pretty shocking state of affairs.

It's why we organized a citizen and scientific Forum on radio protection in 2012 and we will be organizing another one in 2014 on the genetic effects of radiation. Both of these forums, I should say, are fully supported by the city of Geneva and financed largely by them, because Geneva is quite interesting as it has an anti-nuclear constitution, which is a rare thing.

Let's first look in terms of competence at the Nuclear Establishment and just a word about, why I prefer to call it nuclear establishment to the nuclear lobby. A lobby really suggests only a commercial or an industrial interest. But what we have to remember, that the nuclear establishment actually includes our own governments and our own national and international authorities. And therefore it's truly an establishment, which sort of has a veneer of respectability. Now, within the nuclear establishment, the IAEA is only its mouthpiece. The power behind all of that is the International Commission on Radioprotection, the ICRP. This is the body that sets norms and standards in radioprotection. But since it was set up, public health experts have really been absent from the ICRP. And it's a closed, incestuous family, the nuclear establishment, it's made up of the ICRP, UNSCEAR (that's the UN-body), IAEA, national authorities like the one in the USA, which is the BEIR (Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation), EURATOM in Europe and then of course there is the British national authority. The Nuclear Establishment, the ICRP above all - as I said, a closed and incestuous family – and they appoint members among themselves. And in addition to directing industry, the ICRP and its family also control these academic and research institutes even in the area of medical radiology, with is really a terrible, terrible thing.

So, what situation do we have in the terms of competence? Public health specialists have been excluded from the beginning.

Who are these ICRP members? They are all from the military or the nuclear industry or from the medical radiological societies. As Rosalie Bertell, who was the most fantastic writer on nuclear matters, has said: The ICRP is actually a club of users, it is *not* a neutral objective body. In fact they are mostly nuclear physicists (members of the ICRP), there are no public health specialists, there are no radiobiologists, there are no molecular biologists. And remember, that that's extremely important, when we consider that ionizing radiation is mutagenic. It always causes mutations and causes damage at the cellular level. So the very idea, that we do not have molecular biologists in the body, that determines radioprotection norms and standards is an aberration.

And no other body, not even the World Health Organization, can place one of its people on the ICRP.

17:07

Is that standard policy?

Absolutely, it's very, very shocking. You know, the WHO is utterly marginalized. And I think the world's people need to know that, so they can defend their International Health Authority, because it is *their* International Health Authority.

I could add to all of that that what happens at the international level unfortunately is reproduced at the national level, whether it is the USA, the UK or Europe. The nuclear authorities dictate to the health authorities. That is a pretty terrible situation.

17:39

That's completely backwards. I wanted to move this over to the relationship between IndependentWHO and what we might refer as DependentWHO. How much contact has been there between the two and what, if anything, has been the response of those who work for the World Health Organization?

While the World Health Organization does admit and even states, that all its information comes from the IAEA, it simultaneously claims to be completely independent! How it explains that contradiction – I have no idea.

We have had two long meetings with the WHO, but I won't talk about the first one, because we didn't meet the Director General. But we did meet with the Director General in 2011, in other words, just after Fukushima. And we met with five of the highest ranking officials in WHO, so if you like they really did give us full attention. We were accompanied by the mayor of Geneva, because as I have said, Geneva, the city of Geneva, has actually an anti-nuclear article in its constitution.

The main outcomes of that meeting were that we have concluded that WHO has totally abdicated its responsibility. So in a way we don't seek any more to gain any changes in WHO, but our meeting with Dr. Chan – that is the name of the Director General – was extremely interesting, and she did concede a number of very important points. I might say that because she is not an expert in any

way on nuclear power, she may not be aware of the significance of these concessions that she made. But for example she did state that all radiation causes damage. Now it might be very surprising for you to learn that, but that has been denied in the past. In other words, there is no safe threshold.

She also finally conceded that there is a difference between internal radiation and external radiation. And that is one of the major scientific controversies, that has dogged the efforts to expose health consequences. So her recognizing the distinction between internal and external radiation was quite something.

She said that she didn't believe herself that only 50 people had died following the Chernobyl accident. And that is quite an admission considering that up till now and in all its all documents that is the final total of deaths that the WHO was attributing to the Chernobyl accident, which of course is absolute nonsense and an absurdity and has been perceived as such by the public.

In a way we have given up on the World Health Organization – that doesn't mean we have given up our Hippocratic Vigil in front of the WHO in Geneva. In fact we are into our 7th year, it is a permanent presence, but we are no longer interested in persuading the current office holders in WHO. There is no point, nothing is going to happen. This is not where the power is.

So that's why today we have sort of shifted our focus to the responsibilities of individual member states. They are the governing bodies – and in fact it's the ministries of health.

So we have started a Vigil in Paris in front of the French Ministry of Health. Obviously we would like to start one in various capitals of the world.

20:52

[Tell us about this Vigil. The protest that you have been running in front of WHO headquarters in Geneva for seven years that's quite impressive.](#)

We are quiet amazed that we have lasted this long. It started in 2007 on the 26th of April which of course is the date of the Chernobyl accident in 1986. Our group as you can imagine is well over middle age – we are all over 60. Three middle aged protesters with sandwich boards stood at the main reception of the World Health Organization headquarters in Geneva. And then there was a group of about twenty pacifist protesters who came up from town to join them. And if I tell you that the Geneva police were called by the World Health Organization and when we arrived there were barricades, there were even anti-riot vans. It's a kind of exaggerated response to pacifist middle-aged protesters.

21:50

[We had the exact same thing here on the first anniversary of the Fushushima demonstration at the San Onofre Nuclear Power plant. They had the Marines on call at Camp Pendelton, helicopters overhead and I swear police outnumbered the middle aged protesters by a factor of two or three to one.](#)

It is absolutely extraordinary, the overkill. But I have to say that the police in Geneva were actually very sympathetic to us and they have helped us ever since. Now the Hippocratic Vigil is the symbolic part of our action. We have been there as I said for seven years every working day from 8 o'clock in the morning until 6. So all the employees and but also visitors coming to WHO see us – we are extremely visible, I mean we have got very, very large notice boards with signs that have quite strong messages on them, such as: “Complicity in a scientific crime”, “Fukushima, the same cover up as for Chernobyl” that kind of thing.

People might say, well what does WHO care if you are outside in a silent protest and you are all pacifist protesters. And you might well say so. But in a way we take our inspiration from the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo, what happened in Argentina after the dictatorship when many young people and young political dissidents were just “disappeared” by the regime. Their mothers held one of these silent pacifist protests in a square in Argentina and they were there for 10 whole years and they did win their case. So you know we have to be patient.

But there are other aspects of our action. I mean, we work with the United Nations Human Rights bodies, particularly with the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and we work with member states and their missions in Geneva. And of course we write articles and we try to get as much as media attention as possible. There have been many, many short TV reports.

But for the moment what we would be hoping for obviously is a documentary. We had many offers for documentaries none of which have materialized so far but I think they will.

And then on the 26th of April and now unfortunately because of Fukushima every 11th of March there are special actions. And we coordinate these with Japanese groups in Japan.

24:09

As someone who is one mile away from Three Mile Island when it happened, I would encourage you to also include March 28th perhaps as one of your signal days to commemorate the fact that Three Mile Island happened and that there have been health consequences from that, that have, again, been suppressed, much as all the ill health information has been suppressed.

Absolutely. It is incredibly important that people understand that this is not history, none of these things are sort of anniversaries, in fact anniversaries is a bit of inappropriate word, it's the same as Three Mile Island. I'm quite sure that what we should be saying is that the health consequences are continuing. And in terms of genetic effects they are increasing. It's a very terrifying thing and it's very difficult to take that on board, but [all] sorts of studies have been done on genetic effects and it must be the same around Three Mile Island and indeed around any nuclear reactor.

The genetic effects, far from diminishing with time, they increase. Now we don't quite know, scientists don't quite know the reason for that but the research that has been done around Chernobyl, is indeed showing that - these are in fact animal experiments, they're in mice or field voles and creatures like that - the genetic effects after 28 or 30 generations are much, much worse. So it's ... Not not only it's a continuing catastrophe, but it is a worsening catastrophe. I think, that what strikes people when we tell them, that we have been in front of headquarters for seven

years, it is just the very fact of a permanent presence in front of the headquarters of WHO, in other words it doesn't matter that people have never been to Geneva and never been to the headquarters of WHO – it doesn't matter. Just they *know* that there is this protest there and has been there for nearly seven years now. I think it is quite impressive to people.

25:58

What does WHO say about Chernobyl? And what is the whole truth?

Let's look at what WHO hoped would be the final word on Chernobyl. I think what happened was that the nuclear establishment began to be a little bit worried that there was controversy over the health consequences and so they organized what they called the Chernobyl Forum, which produced its report in 2005. This Forum was designed to end the debate – that is what they hoped. It hasn't of course.

Now, incredibly, the WHO and the IAEA and UNSCEAR, which is the UN-body and so on, they still maintain today that 50 people died as a direct result of the accident, they concede that there are 4.000 cases of thyroid cancer, they claim that 99% of them have been successfully treated and they then admit that there *may be, may be* a further 4.000 deaths from other cancers in the future. And they do underline, that these are “potential” deaths. So, what they are trying to do is to sort of end of the debate and say that's the final total.

Even worse, WHO and the nuclear establishment dismisses any health problems at Chernobyl as the result of “*radiophobia*”. In other words, it's just as because people are *afraid*, they *fear*, they *believe* they have been subjected to radio-contamination – in other words, it's all in their imagination. It is hard to credit. Now here is the final conclusion of the Chernobyl Forum, a whole group of UN-organizations including the WHO, including the IAEA, including UNDP. It's in the Chernobyl Forum, which is their definitive document. It says: “*The mental health impact of Chernobyl is the largest public health problem unleashed by the impact on individual and community behavior. Populations in the affected areas exhibit strongly negative attitudes in self assessments of health and wellbeing, and a strong sense of lack of control over their own lives, associated with these perceptions, is an exaggerated sense of the dangers to health of exposure to radiation.*”

Now [I would] just make a couple of comments: If they are really claiming that “radiophobia” is the main problem and that mental health problems are the main problems, how do they explain health effects in children, in rodents, in insects, in plants – it is the most extraordinarily silly claim, but unfortunately it is still bandied about and it's being bandied about, that in Fukushima the major problem is “radiophobia”. It really is an absolutely dreadful ... it's almost criminal.

And I would like just to point out one particularly odious aspect of this. When they talk about a mental health impact – I mean, of course people are worried, of course people are anxious – but this isn't because ... to say, that they have imagined that they have been subjected to radio-contamination, they *have* been subjected to radio-contamination – and so naturally they are anxious.

And on top of that, in amongst all the enormous numbers of health effects is very serious neuro-psychiatric damage. There is damage to every organ system, including the neurological system. So not surprisingly you are going to have an enormous increase in neuro-psychiatric disorders – but put that down to “radiophobia” rather than to the fact that radiation actually has damaged the neurological system – it is an unspeakable dishonesty ...

29:51

[Libbe HaLevy about Nuclear Hotseat](#)

31:00

[And now back to Alison Katz of IndependentWHO](#)

31:05

Let's have a look at the massive discrepancy between the figures that emanate from independent researchers and the figures that emanate from the nuclear establishment. They are an order of a hundred or even a thousand times larger when they emanate from independent research. Now, such a massive discrepancy is far, far larger than we would accept as a sort of normal margin of scientific controversy. In fact it is indicative of a cover-up. And of course the very low figures all emanate from the establishment and the much higher figures, all emanate from independent researchers – so I think we're quite obviously, we're looking at the cover-up.

The figures, as I have said, from WHO appear absurd even to quite a large section of the public. Chernobyl is even recognized and acknowledged as the world's worst industrial accident, with emissions that are several hundred times greater than for Hiroshima and Nagasaki together.

I could give you one example of the real absurdity. Let's have a look at the liquidators. The liquidators – just to remind your listeners – were the men and women, who were brought in to – initially – to fight the fire that took 10 days to extinguish at the reactor and then for years and years afterwards they were involved in the cleanup operations. They are known as liquidators which is a terrible name – but there we are.

There were about 800.000 liquidators from the former USSR. And they were men and women, they were largely recruits from the army, and so they were very young – average age of 33, I think that's important take into account when you look at the mortality. The chief medical officer of the Russian Federation already reported that 10% of its liquidators were already dead by 2001. Similar figures – 10% – were reported by the Ukraine and Belarus as well as the Russian Federation.

So if you are talking of 10% of 800.000, that is already 80.000 liquidators – dead. That is just in the group of liquidators, we are not talking about the group of most contaminated people or the group of evacuees.

And so the figures of 50 become even more ludicrous.

33:22

How can these massive discrepancies be explained?

Very important question, because of course that's what the public wants to understand. They are just confused about these huge massive discrepancies and I don't blame them.

The omissions, the flaws, the manipulation of data, these are legion. The most important part of the explanation is simply that the WHO and the IAEA only take into account three very specific population groups in the three most affected countries. There is absolutely no scientific or moral justification for omitting from consideration, the rest of the population in those countries, the rest of Europe, which was very seriously contaminated, and the rest of the world.

It's very important for us to remember that *57% of the fallout came down outside those three countries, that were most affected*, Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. In 13 European countries, 50% of the territory was dangerously contaminated.

So how is it, that the WHO has no interest whatsoever on reporting on health consequences in European countries. You could say, why is it not interested in reporting in all countries including the USA? And there *are* reports from the USA of effects. Even though the USA, the Americas in general, were the continents that were the least affected. But there have been extremely well designed studies in the USA, but probably Joseph Mangano, I believe you talk to the other day ...

34:56

Actually talking with you is part of a two part series. I have a long interview with Joe [Joseph Mangano, AdT] completely on the epidemiology of the WHO/IAEA- connection, where he goes in great detail about the studies and about how the statistics have been rigged.

This is the kind of evidence that actually could not be refuted were it known to the public. Another reason for, you know, how can these discrepancies be explained is that WHO only considers cancer. And then, more or less only thyroid cancer. And I just want to say something about thyroid cancers in children, because when they claim that 99% of these have been cured, it is a disgustingly dishonest thing to say.

Thyroid-cancer in children: Even if they have had the malignant tumor removed, even if they are taking thyroxine to compensate, it is an extremely serious condition in children. And if they have had it as children, knowing the long latency period of development of cancer, they are going to have extremely serious health problems all of their lives. It is a disgraceful thing for WHO to claim 99% of these are cured. There is no such thing as *cure* in that sense. These are children with very, very serious health problems. But as I said, thyroid-cancer is not at all the only cancer, it is the one that WHO could not deny because it had increased by – I don't know – 50 or 100 fold, rather than just doubling. WHO does consider *certain* congenital malformations, but again it has extremely carefully defined these malformations in order to reduce the number to a strictly limited, very tiny number.

What's interesting is that the WHO and the Nuclear Establishment dismisses all other estimates. Of course they dismiss other estimates from independent scientists as unscientific. Whether it is

Greenpeace, whether it's medical doctors from Russia, scientists from the whole of the former Soviet Union. WHO will always claiming these are people who ... they don't have very high standards of science. And that is very ironic, because actually if there is one criticism you cannot make of the former Soviet Union: They had extremely high standards of science and medical science. And it's particularly the ironic because actually the establishment's science is so flawed, it is so full of omissions, that it can justifiably be defined as pseudoscience.

37:21

Can you give us some examples of these flaws and omissions?

The most important one is the fact that they are using the *wrong model*. And they have been using the wrong model for health consequences for over 50 years, in fact since Hiroshima. We call it the Hiroshima Model. What happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki obviously: It was a one time, massive, external, exposure. Now after nuclear accidents the exposure is continuous, it is internal contamination and it is very low dose. The major disinformation relates to the refusal to consider low dose internal radio-contamination. These two kinds of exposure are simply incomparable in terms of the biological damage at the molecular level. Dr. Chris Busby, who is a British scientist, who's been responsible for denouncing the cover-up in the UK, has made a fantastic comparison in order to explain to the public: He says it's like the difference between warming yourself in front of a coal fire and taking a hot coal from that fire and swallowing it.

We have to remember that internal contamination at Chernobyl accounts for 95% of the contamination. And that is because radionuclides are in the soil – they are in the air, but above all they are in the soil – and these people are eating food products that have been raised and produced in contaminated soil. So we are talking about the meat, we are talking about the fruit, we are talking about the vegetables, we are talking about the food from the forests – mushrooms, berries – this makes up their diet and they have been eating contaminated food since 1986. And that gets concentrated inside peoples' bodies. And it is that concentration inside organs that is so dangerous, particularly of course in children, because children are so much more vulnerable to radio-contamination. Although for years the nuclear establishment denied any difference between internal and external radiation, today they recognize. They have to, they would have be laughed at, because all nuclear physicists do understand that there is a huge difference between internal and external contamination.

And it is the central controversy. Even the ICRP recognizes that there is no safe threshold for ionizing radiation. And how could there be? Because all ionizing radiation is mutagenic.

There is a fundamental omission in terms of simple biology of radio-contamination and that is that all organ systems are affected. I think I said a few minutes ago, that cancer is the only problem that is considered. That is absurd. We all know – well, most of us should know – that radio-contamination affects the immune system. If it affects the immune systems, it affects every organ system: cardiac, digestive, respiratory, endocrine, musculoskeletal, neurological, reproductive, and of course it results in malformations and genetic damage. All of that is in addition to the cancers.

40:30

This is of course devastating information. You mention manipulation of the data. Could you explain further about that?

There is a huge range of different kinds of manipulation of data and they sort of range from the flagrant and the outrageous to the subtle and dishonest. Let's start with the flagrant and outrageous. There has been falsification and suppression of data. There are attacks against independent researchers and then of course there is the example of Professor Bandachevsky who was a prisoner of conscience of Amnesty International. He was released in 2005 under international pressure.

There is simple censorship of studies, or just cut off the funding. The thousands of studies from the countries most affected have just been ignored, they have never been translated from Russian or from Slavic languages.

The initial dose has been ignored – it has been averaged across populations.

They have excluded entire scientific domains such as internal low dose, hot particles.

They have ended studies after 10 years, so that illnesses with a long latency period can be ignored.

They have claimed decreases in childhood cancers, when actually they have become adults and then are no longer in that data base! And so on and so on ... There has been the most extraordinary manipulation of statistics on cancer – everywhere in the world, whether it's in the countries concerned, but also in England and I don't doubt in the United States, in France, absolutely everywhere.

There is another interesting aspect to all of this. And this is a particularly despicable sort of reasoning that is used by the nuclear establishment and unfortunately it's rather difficult to deal with. Basically what they say is: You'll never be able to prove it. You will never be able to prove that people's illnesses are connected to radiation. And in some ways they are right – it is extremely difficult to prove against the background of so many cancers. For example, because we have cancers that are caused by chemical pollution. So it is often extremely difficult to attribute cases with certainty to radioactive rather than to chemical contamination.

However it is not impossible. Professor Yablokov does explain the epidemiological methods that are used in order to relate illnesses to radio-contamination very clearly. And basically you hold socioeconomic factors constant and you compare the illnesses of populations in high, medium and low radio-contaminated areas. This is really very basic epidemiology, it's easy to do and he has done it. So to claim that you cannot attribute illnesses to radio-contamination is actually ... it is wrong, it is unscientific and that is why we call it pseudoscience.

43:26

The book that you are referring to is *Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment* and it was written by Professor Yablokov, who is a previous interviewee here on Nuclear Hotseat as well as Professor Nesterenko and a Dr. Nesterenko who are all eminent scientists. It was edited by Dr. [Janette Sherman](#), who's also been a guest several times on Nuclear Hotseat. Talk to us about what that book is and why it is so important.

It's a huge tome: 330 pages, 800 references. It draws on at least 5.000 scientific studies. Although I have to say there are apparently at least 30.000 scientific studies available on the internet for anybody who would like to go and look at them.

I think it would be useful at this point just to summarize what this book says about the health consequences. It's a short quote, but I think it is worth citing in full:

Thousands of independent studies in Ukraine, Belarus, and the Russian Federation, and in many other countries contaminated to varying degrees by radionuclides from Chernobyl, have established that there has been a significant increase in all types of cancer; in diseases of the respiratory, cardiovascular, gastrointestinal, urogenital, endocrine, immune, lymphoid, and nervous systems; prenatal, perinatal, infant and child mortality, spontaneous abortions, deformities and genetic anomalies, disturbance and retardation of mental development, neuropsychological illness and blindness.

These increases – this is me now commenting on the quote – these increases are not trivial, they cannot be dismissed, they are not increases of a few percent. There is a doubling, a trebling or quadrupling, more in some cases.

Now, why is it (*the book*) so significant? It is a real threat, because the World Health Organization – this time – cannot dismiss the New York Academic of Sciences' publication. It is a venerable institution. And I would like to pay tribute to Janette Sherman for getting this thing through, because I don't doubt that there was considerable opposition. It is a major coup that she got it through.

It is very interesting to know that the World Health Organization tried to pretend that the New York Academy of Sciences was kind of withdrawing from this publication. This is an absolute nonsense. The New York Academy of Sciences states itself that it only publishes material that it considers has scientific validity. So I will dismiss absolutely all of these sort of slights directed at this publication. It is a publication of the NYAS and it will remain so for the historical record and that is because they judged it to be scientifically valid.

You know the kinds of criticism that WHO has made against this publication, it said: "The book is not peer reviewed". And I do want to comment on that, because I think it is very significant. That is crass nonsense. Because books are *not* peer reviewed. What are peer reviewed are the scientific medical articles that are published in peer reviewed journals. It is not a book that is peer reviewed. And we decided, because we were so angry at this comment, we decided to actually analyze the respective chapters on mortality in the Chernobyl Forum. Remember that's the final verdict of the Nuclear Establishment on Chernobyl, and we compared it with the NYAS-book. And what did we find? 40% of the references in the New York Academy of Sciences' book are from peer reviewed journals and a very small 18% of the references are from peer reviewed journals in the nuclear establishment book. So when WHO says, that this is not serious science in the NYAS-book they are completely wrong. And if any book could be criticized for not being based on peer reviewed science it is the nuclear establishment Chernobyl Forum book.

We only compared the chapters on mortality. There are lots of other chapters. I couldn't do all of the chapters, it takes far too long, so I decided just to make a comparison of those two respective chapters on mortality.

47:53

Now that we have a clear picture of WHO: You have given us background, we have a context for understanding their actions. Talk to us about how WHO is dealing with the disaster at Fukushima?

Incredibly, given public skepticism, it's dealing with it at exactly the same way. To our astonishment, two days after the Fukushima accident, WHO actually stated that there was no public health impact. That is a statement that is based on *zero* science. There was none.

As a matter of fact though independent researchers had already understood that there had been core meltdowns in three of the reactors. And they knew that because of the composition of the emissions. And they have been proved right. Furthermore, many of those independent researchers knew of the terrifying possibility of a much, much worse scenario with the containment pools holding huge quantities of used fuel. And for that anybody wanting to know further about that they just have to go to Arnie Gundersen's [Fairewinds site](#).

49:02

Arnie was interviewed last week on Nuclear Hotseat, specifically about the situation in Fukushima and what he would do if he were in charge of the site and making it as safe as is humanly possible at this time.

Well that is very interesting and I must look that up, I'd love to see that interview. Just to say that WHO made this ludicrous statement about no public health impact on the basis of no information whatsoever.

And I think what is very important to know is: they had no information. And yet information was available from independent researchers elsewhere in the world.

WHO has produced two reports now on Fukushima. The first one is to evaluate the exposures on preliminary dose estimates. And the second one, which is simply based on those dose estimates, is on the likely health effects. So in fact they are based on the same data. And these reports have been very heavily criticized by all kinds of people.

But I'm particularly interested in the critique that was issued by [IPPNW](#), which is the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. And two very excellent critiques have been made by Alex Rosen and they are very worthwhile looking at.

His first criticism is that WHO's estimates of the amounts of radionuclides emitted are lower, they are considerably lower, they are lower by 50% to 80% than everyone else's estimates including the estimates of TEPCO. You really have to say, my goodness, WHO is really trying to give the lowest possible figure.

His second criticism is that two critical populations have been ignored. The first of those is the people in the 20 km zone whose exposure before and during evacuation will have been very, very high. And the other critical population is the workers who were on site during and in the days and the weeks following the accident.

Those are the two most critical populations whose exposures ought to have been considered. Why were they not considered? We have no answer.

Now, in WHO's calculations, they use a single estimated dose range. So in effect they are averaging doses between children and adults. This is a medical and scientific nonsense because children are many, many times more vulnerable. It is absolutely unacceptable to use reference levels for nuclear workers or for the public as if this could possibly apply to children, but that is what they have done.

Most seriously WHO has accepted the introduction by the Japanese government of the level of 20 mSv per year, despite the fact that the international limit, that is set by the ICRP, the International Commission on Radiological Protection, is 1 mSv per year. For children this is criminal

52:03

Was this shift in the amount, making it 20 times higher, did that take place after the accident?

Exactly. The Japanese Government recognizing that populations were living in areas where the 1 mSv per year couldn't possibly be respected, knowing that they could not evacuate such a huge number of people, what did they do instead? They upped the acceptable level! And it is an extraordinary thing to do, because the international level is set by the ICRP. Yes, they upped it – your question is important – after the accident. It is extraordinarily for the WHO to more or less approve that decision of the Japanese government.

Another thing that WHO is ignoring is the alarming reports of thyroid abnormalities in children. Now thyroid abnormalities are the first signs of illness that are seen after a nuclear accident. And indeed Japanese researchers have reported that 44% of Japanese children (*added in transcript in contaminated areas*) are showing very serious abnormalities, it's in the form of nodules and cysts in the thyroid gland and those are precursors, possible precursors of thyroid cancer. To find this in 44% of children is an extraordinary finding which should be made public, not just in Japan of course, but internationally. If WHO does not even mention that in its report on the health effects, it is not doing its job.

So we have seen WHO is completely uncritical of the Japanese government.

And it is interesting to note, thank goodness, that someone in the UN-family is doing something honestly. The negligence of the Japanese has been heavily criticized by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health. This is a man called Anand Grover, who is currently the Special Rapporteur. His documents are also worth going and looking at on the net. He pointed out for example the failure to use, what we call SPEEDI data, this is data that the Japanese government had at its disposal to understand, to be able to measure the levels of contamination in various districts in Japan. They failed to use that data with this ridiculous result: populations were evacuated from areas to other areas – even though those areas turned out to be far more polluted than where they had been at

home. And that is because they ignored this data from SPEEDI that showed that the wind had carried the contamination to these areas to which they were being evacuated.

So we are talking about really criminal negligence. There was a failure to distribute iodine. Everybody knows that you must distribute iodine to children and it must be taken within 24 hours, 48 hours. There is no point in taking iodine a week later. The Japanese Government failed to distribute iodine. And WHO had no comment to make on that.

Another thing in the WHO text is that it appears to suggest throughout that there is a safe level. And this goes against even all nuclear authorities, even the ICRP, even the BEIR of the USA, in other words, your nuclear authority, which acknowledges that the slightest amount of radioactivity can cause harmful tissue damage and genetic mutations.

So for the WHO to be doing worse than the nuclear authorities of the USA and of the ICRP is really something.

There are some quite amusing examples that Alex Rosen cites, for example they were supposed to be sampling the levels of radionuclides in food products such as eggs and he reports that a total, the grand total of 17 – one seven – 17 eggs was sampled. In [...] communities around Fukushima is pathetic, it is pitiful, but it is also criminal. They ignored the phenomenon of bioaccumulation in fish! These are elementary things that quite a lot of educated laypeople are well aware of, that fish is a very important part of Japanese diet and we all know that it (added in transcript *radionuclides*) accumulates in fish at the end of the food chain.

So these are really very, very terrible criticisms to be being made of the WHO report. Another one is that there is no mention of ongoing problems at the site.

And Alex Rosen finishes his report by reporting to us that who were the authors of the WHO report? Well, they have claimed to be 30 national experts and I don't doubt that they are the 30 national experts. But every one of them works for part of the Nuclear Establishment, most of them for the IAEA and of course many *also* work for national regulatory nuclear authorities.

And so we are back to the subject of the beginning of our interview which is conflict of interest. Public health aspects of nuclear activities are being managed, controlled and directed by the Nuclear Establishment. I think there couldn't be a clearer example of conflict of interest.

57:17

What has the media coverage been like for IndependentWHO and your perspective on the nuclear issue?

We have had French Television, we have had Swiss Television, we have had radio. Obviously what we would like is an hour long documentary on the World Health Organization's complicity in this dreadful cover-up. We have had many, many offers from various TV-companies but it hasn't happened yet.

57:44

The listeners to Nuclear Hotseat are literally on five continents. How can we best work with IndependentWHO?

I think there are two things. The very first thing to do is to go on to IndependentWHO's site, it's very easy you just google IndependentWHO and you will find it immediately. It is in several languages including of course English. And the second thing to do is to take up our public health angle. Try to take up the fact that the health consequences have been hidden from the public. That means that the Nuclear Establishment has deprived the public and the international scientific community of essential medical and scientific information. In other words that is a scientific crime. The current cancer epidemic is due to pollution, chemical pollution and radioactive pollution.

I think that if the public understands that they have not been told what are the health and environmental consequences of Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, Fukushima, the functioning of nuclear reactors all together,

I think they would be outraged, because they do believe that the truth has been told.

I think from the moment that they know that *no*, the health consequences have been hidden from them, it's a very useful angle for nuclear activists.

59:00

That was Alison Katz of IndependentWHO.

Epilog Libbe HaLevy

Originalquelle: <http://www.nuclearhotseat.com/nuclear-hotseat-118-whoiaea-unholy-alliance-lies-intl-nuclear-health-stats/>

Transcript, Lektorat: www.afaz.at (ho,lg,ak,mv,akatz)

Dieses Schriftstücks steht unter GFDL, siehe www.gnu.org/licenses/old-licenses/fdl-1.2.html. Vervielfältigung und Verbreitung – auch in geänderter Form – sind jederzeit gestattet, Änderungen müssen mitgeteilt werden (email: afaz@gmx.at). www.afaz.at Dezember 2013 /v1