

UN's UNSCEAR FUKUSHIMA RADIATION REPORT
Blasted by IPPNW'S Alex Rosen

Listen here: <http://lhalevy.audioacrobat.com/download/audioacrobat-10760-u-1716035-s-1.mp3>

Libbe HaLevy: (12:10) Now for this weeks interview: In April when the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation or UNSCEAR published the report that seriously – if not criminally – understated the health dangers of the Fukushima nuclear disaster, I knew the interview I wanted to get, it just took me a little while to get it; but its got and here it is. Alex Rosen is a German pediatrician who is vice president of the International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War in Germany. He is also a former vice chair of the International IPPNW Board of Directors. He uses that organization's recently published “Critical Analysis of the UNSCEAR Report” to decode its methodology and in effect demolish its credibility.

Alex Rosen welcome to Nuclear Hotseat.

Alex Rosen: (13:04) Hello, greetings from Berlin.

LH: What is the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War or IPPNW and what is your position in regard to it?

AR: (13:15) IPPNW is an international NGO founded in 1980 by a Soviet and an American cardiologist who had the crazy notion to not just save their patients but the whole world by making everyone understand the true dangers behind nuclear weapons. They managed to get the leaders of their two countries down to negotiate arms reduction and so received the Noble Peace Prize in 1985. IPPNW has been around since the 1980ies and has expanded its mission not just to work against nuclear weapons but also against all parts of the nuclear chain, that is: the uranium mining, the civil use of nuclear energy, the military use of nuclear weapons, all the way to the problem of nuclear waste. My position at IPPNW is that I am currently the vice chair of the German affiliates. We have more than 60 affiliates around the world and the German one which has its head office here in Berlin has about 7000 members and we have a board that I am the member of.

LH: (14:20) What is the IPPNW's previous relationship or stance as regards UNSCEAR?

AR: UNSCEAR, The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, has been widely criticized not just by IPPNW but by doctors and scientists around the world for its stance on nuclear energy, especially regarding the accident or the catastrophe in Chernobyl. And this is a history or the story that we see repeating itself now again in Fukushima that UNSCEAR is issuing statements and press releases that we feel are not very representative of what is really going on on the ground. So IPPNW Germany has been criticizing UNSCEAR ever since Chernobyl for its stance on promoting or whitewashing nuclear catastrophies. Right now we are working together with more than a dozen other IPPNW affiliates round the world including the US affiliate on actually making known, making public, what UNSCEAR is saying and where their report about the Fukushima disaster is wrong.

LH: (15:31) IPPNW has issued a critique, an annotated critique of the UNSCEAR report on Fukushima. Before we get into this specific subject, how was this put together?

AR: Well, we are an international organization, so we have people all over the world working on this

topic and mainly the US and the German affiliates have been working on this topic of the UNSCEAR report, meeting regularly on Skype-calls, sending each other documents, exchanging views and getting expertise from all over the world: from India, from the UK, from Australia, from Austria and Switzerland, from some of our African affiliates like in Nigeria. Scientists and doctors all across the world bringing together their expertise on the health effects of ionizing radiation in order to really take a critical look at UNSCEAR's findings and make public what we feel is wrong or is missing.

LH: (16:28) There are ten specific conclusions that were reached by this analysis as regards the UNSCEAR report – let's go through them individually, so you can explain to us the exact factors that led to the conclusions and the criticisms that you have about the report. The first is that the validity of UNSCEAR's source term estimates is in doubt.

AR: (16:53) Yes. When we looked at UNSCEAR's report the most obvious question that we had first of all is: which facts do they base their calculations of the health effects in Fukushima on. And one of the most important parameters when you look at radioactive contamination is of course how many radionuclides, how much radioactivity was released by the accident. And there are several calculations or estimations that are circulating internationally by different organizations and they give different numbers on the size or the magnitude of radioactive emissions. And what UNSCEAR does, it doesn't take the most neutral source, it doesn't take a median between the highest and the lowest estimation, it doesn't take a source that you could argue this would be the most believable. They take the Japanese Atomic Energy Association's scientists, whose estimation on the amount of radioactive emissions is lower by a few factors than the estimations by neutral sources like the Norwegian Institution for Air Research or the Austrian Central Institute for Meteorology. (18:05) So just to give one example: UNSCEAR says that the emission of Cesium¹³⁷ – so that's a very particular radionuclide that's important to know when you talk about radioactive contamination – was 9 petabecquerel (PBq), so that's 9 quadrillion becquerel, whereas the independent Norwegian Institution for Air Research they found 37 PBq, more than 4 times that number. Now we're not saying that the Norwegian are completely right and the Japanese Atomic Energy Association is completely wrong. All we are saying is that there are different numbers, you have to closer look at who is publishing these numbers, with which interests, how valid are their calculations, and does it really make sense to take the lowest possible numbers which come from the Japanese Atomic Energy Association directly – an organization that is being heavily criticized by the Japanese Parliament in fact for being co-responsible for the nuclear disaster in Fukushima. And if you take their numbers, their low estimates, then obviously your calculations that you do with these numbers will have a systematic underestimation of the health effects in the end.

LH: (19:11) There are serious concerns regarding the calculations of internal radiation.

AR: Yes. That's the next issue that we are dealing with in our report or our critique of the UNSCEAR report: the concerns regarding the calculations of internal radiation. So the next parameter after looking at the emissions, the magnitude of the emissions, is you want to see how much of this radioactivity was actually incorporated by people; and with incorporated I mean inhaled in terms of radioactive dust floating in the atmosphere or ingested with food or drink. So it is very important to look at the radioactive contamination of food and drink in Japan, especially in the affected region in northeastern Honshu Island and to look at how much of this radioactivity would actually be ingested by people or inhaled. And in order to do that you need to have food samples, first of all you need to go on the fields and markets and actually take samples in order to calculate or estimate how much radioactivity is in everyone's food. And you need to make assumptions on the amount of food people eat, the origin of their food.

And what UNSCEAR does is first of all they base their entire calculations on internal radiation on one

single source. And now, this source could be an independent scientific committee or organization that has done independent testing, but instead what UNSCEAR does is, they take as the single source of their calculation of internal radiation the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA. And we all know that the IAEA was founded in order to promote civil nuclear energy. So they don't have a very big interest in actually showing a lot of negative effects of the Fukushima nuclear disaster. (21:05)

In fact you could say they are very biased and they are not the best source to base calculations of internal radiation on. But this is what UNSCEAR does, they take the IAEA food data base as the single source of their calculations and nowhere in the document, in the UNSCEAR report does it say how these samples were taken, who took them, where they were taken, when they were taken. It just refers to a spread sheet, the food data base, which never appears in the document and which is supposed to be published at a later point in a sort of addendum but which still isn't available to researchers and independent scientists like us, wanting to see where this data actually comes from. So there is no way to check or to control how valid these food samples were. What we do know is that the IAEA data base (of which certain parts have been published by the WHO) shows maximum levels of radioactive contamination which are much lower than even the Japanese government's numbers.

So we are very worried that by taking this data base as the single source you are actually underestimating the effects of internal radiation and adding to that the assumptions that UNSCEAR bases its calculations on, assumptions on the amount of food people eat from the affected region, the amount of checks and controls that are taking place in Fukushima... these assumptions are just wrong. They are not based on reality and they draw a picture that is much too optimistic in our view.

LH: (22:40) Another issue that was raised by the critique of UNSCEAR report is that the dose assessments of the Fukushima workers cannot be relied upon.

AR: Yes. This is another point where again we are talking about which sources you base your calculations on. If you're looking at the group of Fukushima workers, you think that you take independent research data on these people in order to calculate their health effects. But instead UNSCEAR bases its numbers solely on the numbers that it gets from TEPCO. Now TEPCO is the company that ran Fukushima before it went bankrupt over the catastrophe. It's a company that owns several nuclear power plants in Japan that made millions if not billions of dollars with nuclear energy and which obviously does not have an interest in making this catastrophe look worse than it is.

Instead what we see is that they don't just hire people themselves but what they do often times they hire subcontractors. And these subcontractors hire other subcontractors. So in the end the people actually doing the dirty work in and for TEPCO are people that are so far away from TEPCO's rules and regulations that it is very difficult to actually make sure that these people adhere to the safety standards that these peoples' exposition to radioactive contamination is actually properly measured. There have been reports of missing dosimeters, there have been reports of lead coverings on the dosimeters in order to manipulate the readings, there have been reports of mafia connections in the group of subcontractors. So there is a lot of shady deals and corruption going on on these levels. And taking the numbers of TEPCO as the sole source to calculate health effects of the workers without any independent data available, nothing from the government, nothing from independent researchers, just TEPCO's own data, again leads to systematic underestimation of the health effects.

LH: (24:43) Excuse me, I just have to pause for a moment, because it's one thing to say, you know that they are wrong about it, it's another to hear the specifics of exactly how they manipulated it. Another conclusion that was reached by the report is that the UNSCEAR report ignores the effects of fallout on the non-human biota.

AR: Yes. What that means is that we are not just talking about humans obviously, we are talking about

plants, we are talking about animals. And what we have learned from Chernobyl is that especially in the animal population you are much better able to demonstrate health effects and transgenerational effects, – not just on the animals that were alive and present at the time of the disaster, but their offspring, generations down the line. And obviously with butterflies and mice you have much better chances at researching these transgenerational effects than you do in the human population where obviously people are not guinea pigs. So what scientists have been doing and there is a very active US group around Tim Mousseau, who is a scientist who has been traveling to Chernobyl for many years catching birds and looking at different types of animals and their health effects in regards to radioactive contamination and they have been able to find several very meaningful health effects concerning fertility, concerning mutations and all of this knowledge is out there, it is published in peer reviewed journals, it is there and you can research it on the internet, but it doesn't appear in the UNSCEAR report. (26:19)

What the UNSCEAR report says is that there is no real data on the non human biota and therefore they did not take it in to consideration. And this is something we are criticizing obviously because – you can't say because something happens to butterflies, it will also happen to humans – but at least and this is what we know from pharmacological studies and other health studies, you can deduce something from it and you can say: “Well, if this happens in all types of mammals, why shouldn't it happen in human beings?” Especially the transgenerational effects which are so difficult to demonstrate in human population can be demonstrated, can be seen, can be proven in animal populations and that is at least food for thought, it is at least something that should be considered.

You should say: well, we see this effect in animals, we see this effect in plants, we expect a similar effect in human beings. How large it is we don't know at this point, but at least it is ground enough for the research. But this is not happening. This is our criticism. What we are doing in our paper is basically listing some of the findings of Tim Mousseau and his group and asking UNSCEAR to include it in future publications.

LH: (27:26) The next issue that was raised by the critique was the special vulnerability of the embryo to radiation and that it was not taken into account.

AR: Yes, this is an issue that is very important to me as a pediatrician. Human beings don't react to radioactivity the same way. Radioactivity has stochastic effects, that means that it is not about determining a certain dose or certain amount of radioactivity that is harmful and everything below that is safe. It's not like that. It's actually similar to when you talk about smoking. You can't say: “Two cigarettes is fine and three cigarettes will kill you”. It's all about chances that you take. And the more you smoke or the more contact you have to radioactive exposure the higher your chances of actually getting a disease, of getting cancer. And obviously this is like in smoking very dependent on your own genetic background, on your own immune system. So obviously someone who has a very good immune system, who is rather good at repairing cell defects from radiation or other toxins will have a lower chance of actually catching cancer - for example after being exposed to radiation.

So there are people out there, for example people with immune defects, people who take medication that reduces their immune functions and children whose immune system are not fully developed yet, who have a much higher vulnerability towards radioactive effects. And this is not taken into consideration, especially the unborn child which is the most vulnerable to radioactivity. We know that from research that goes back into the 1950ies. An adult can very well take an x-ray of the chest without developing cancer afterwards. But we know that an unborn child in the woman's womb is so vulnerable to radioactivity or to ionizing radiation that in fact even small amounts of radiation like from a normal x-ray can actually increase the chances of a child getting cancer by very substantial degrees. So one single x-ray to the abdomen of a pregnant woman would increase the chance of getting cancer within childhood by 50%. And this is just one x-ray and we are talking about much higher doses in Fukushima.

So by saying that all people are alike and all children are alike and there is no difference between an unborn child or a child of five years old ... this radiobiologic knowledge that we have accumulated over several decades is just completely discounted in the UNSCEAR report and they are acting like we wouldn't know that children and specially unborn children have a much higher vulnerability.

So that's a point that I especially as a pediatrician feel very strongly about. That needs to be corrected. It cannot be that we base all our recommendations regarding radiation dose levels on healthy adults, healthy male adults, instead of actually on the most vulnerable population which is the unborn child.

LH: (30:28) Here is one of the other points that really struck me in the list of objections that have been voiced by the IPPNW against the UNSCEAR report, and that is non cancer diseases and hereditary effects were ignored by UNSCEAR.

AR: Yes, that's another big problem. Even though we know for many years that radiation, ionizing radiation, causes not just cancer effects but non cancer effects as well such as: cardiovascular diseases, glaucoma, psychological and neurological effects, endocrinologic diseases, diseases of the thyroid for example. We know all of this also from the victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but also from the liquidators of Chernobyl – the people that were sent in to clean up the mess after the explosion – and this knowledge is completely ignored by UNSCEAR. They act as if there was no scientific evidence for it, even though there are numerous studies that show the significant effects of radiation on for example cardiovascular diseases or thyroid diseases in people who received low dose radiation after Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

And the same is true for transgenerational effects, genetic effects in future generations that we also see for example in the studies on animals by Tim Mousseau that I mentioned earlier, but also on human populations where the effects for example on children of British nuclear workers lead to increased leukemia rates, if their parents were exposed to radioactivity. So these are effects that you can't just argue away, instead of arguing away, they've just been ignored by UNSCEAR.

LH: (32:13) UNSCEAR also did, according to the analysis, misleading comparisons of nuclear fallout with background radiation.

AR: So this is what UNSCEAR and other organizations are frequently doing. They're saying: "Hey, we're just talking about an additional radiation dose of one or two millisieverts per year per person, so this can't really be harmful, because natural background radiation is already one or two millisieverts a year." And that's where they're wrong. Obviously natural background radiation is something that you can't completely avoid and there are regions in the world where it is higher and regions in the world where it's lower. But studies have repeatedly shown that in the regions where it's higher, it's actually causing more cancer and in the regions where it's lower, people have less cancer. And people who are exposed to more radon gas in their homes because they live in an environment that is very rich in radioactive substances in the ground have higher cancer rates and people who fly a lot, transatlantic flights and have increased cosmic radiation: they get more cancers; and people who are exposed to higher degrees of terrestrial radiation, they also have a higher cancer rate. Because the correlation between cancer or the chance of getting cancer and radiation dose is linear, linear without a threshold, so it goes down to zero. Even small radiation doses lead to a measurable rise in the chance to develop cancer. And there is no threshold under which you can say everything is safe and this is the story that they are trying to sell to people. If it's just one or two millisieverts per year that you're exposed to because of Fukushima fallout then you don't have anything to worry about. But that's not true. That's like saying someone: "Listen, you're just smoking one cigarette a day, that's something that everyone smokes, so you shouldn't worry about it." But people who want to live healthy lives, people who don't want to be exposed to radiation, people who don't want an increased cancer rate, they should have the right to live in an environment

that is healthy and that is free of radioactive contamination from nuclear fallout. This is something that's man made, it's preventable and in the regions where it is not preventable anymore because fallout happened, you should give options to the people to move to other places – but this is not happening.

LH: (34:32) This next conclusion number 8 is – I think – masterful understatement and that is that the IPPNW says that UNSCEAR's interpretations of the findings are questionable.

AR: Yes, what we mean by that is, it's not just the basic calculations on the data and the assumptions and it's not just the way that they calculate it, but in the end they draw conclusions and these conclusions you could say: “Okay, now we can calculate how many deaths or how many cancer cases are to be expected.” But UNSCEAR doesn't do that. They don't seriously discuss their findings.

So, I mean we're walking a tight line here. In the one hand we are criticizing UNSCEAR for systematically underestimating the health effects on the other hand we are asking them to at least use the findings that they have and interpret them in a way for people to understand them. It is not very useful to tell people this is the collective dose that the population will be exposed to because people can't really do anything with that number. But if you take this number and you actually use the risk factors that are publicly available and you calculate what health effects, what number of cancer cases or cancer deaths this leads to, than you can tell people what they actually can expect. And at the same time we have to say that these expectations or these estimations are probably still an underestimation, due to the factors that we mentioned earlier.

LH: (36:07) Another criticism brought forward is that the protective measures taken by the authorities are misrepresented.

AR: Yes, UNSCEAR mentions in its report that radiation exposure to the population would have been much higher if the government hadn't protected the population so well. And while this is obviously true, the population could have been exposed to more radiation in Japan, we feel that it's wrong to cheer the Japanese government for it's wonderful clean up efforts or it's wonderful preventive efforts because actually what happened in Fukushima – and this is not our opinion, this was written by the Japanese Parliament's investigation committee: “There was a complete breakdown of the measures that should actually have protected the population; there was complete and utter chaos, people did not know what they were doing, there were no plans in the drawer, the prime minister was completely taken by surprise. He didn't know that Japan had for example a radiation tracking system in place that could have let people know where radiation was actually traveling to. Instead people were evacuated from areas of low radiation to areas of high radiation because no one in the upper echelons knew that the system existed.

We all know that stable iodine tablets can prevent radioactive iodine from a nuclear catastrophe from traveling to the thyroid and causing thyroid cancer, but in Japan these stable iodine tablets were not distributed to the population in order to prevent a mass panic. So there were a lot of issues concerning the immediate response to the catastrophe, concerning the evacuations, the extend of the evacuations, the clean up efforts, where it's not very useful to actually say that everything went perfectly and otherwise the catastrophe would have been much bigger. (37:55) We feel that it's just fitting at this point to join the Japanese Parliament's investigation commission in their criticism of how badly actually the first response was and what could have been done better, because I mean we're dealing with the problem that could happen any day again in Japan with more than 50 nuclear sites and an earthquake prone region. So this is not something that happened once and will never happen again. We know from Chernobyl, we know from Fukushima, from Harrisburg that it could happen any time and in every country. So in order to improve the safety plans and the public safety for the population it's not very useful to just say: “This time everything went well” because it didn't.

And obviously it could have been much worse. Yes, Japan was very lucky so to speak. The people of Japan were very lucky that the wind was blowing eastwards and blew more than 80% of the radiation out to the sea. If the wind had blown south even just for one day the metropolis of Tokyo would have been subjected to radioactive fallout. This is something that we don't want to imagine what that would have caused. But in effect there was just one day of wind going northwest which now is causing most of the problems that we are seeing in the heavily affected cities and communities – just from one day of radioactive fallout. All the other days the Japanese were lucky enough that the wind blew east. So, yes in some way you can say that this catastrophe could have been much much worse.

LH: (39:27) The last point made is that conclusions from collective dose estimates were not represented.

AR: Yes. Like I said before the UNSCEAR report mentioned the collective dose estimates, so they said how many person-sieverts the Japanese population will be exposed to in the coming decades but they failed to actually say what this would mean for the people. To give an example: we tried to add this estimation. Just to give an example of how we did that: UNSCEAR says that there will be a total collective dose of 48,000 person-sieverts. So the total collective dose is the sum of all the individual doses of every person in Japan that is exposed to radioactivity due to Fukushima over their life time. This is the total collective dose, so 48,000 person-sieverts. And if you take the risk factors that are internationally accepted than this will lead to between 4,000 to 16,000 excess cases of cancer in Japan. Again based on the underestimations that I just explained. So the number would probably be much higher if you actually took the right data and the right assumptions. But this is if you just take the numbers that UNSCEAR represents and calculates you are dealing with 4 to 16,000 additional cases of cancer and 2 to 9,000 of these fatal. (40:49) So you have 16,000 people who would develop cancer due to Fukushima who would otherwise not have developed cancer. You have a lot of them who survive after chemotherapy, operations or radiation therapy, but you have 9,000 or a little more than 9,000 people who will die because of cancers related to the Fukushima nuclear accident. This is something they have to tell the people. This is something that you have to admit and say: "Listen this was a huge catastrophe and this is what it will lead to."

And what we can do is try to reduce this number by really having strict controls of radioactive contamination in the food, moving people especially young families and children away from the radioactively contaminated regions, giving them all support that we can in order to get them out of the contaminated areas and to give them health care and health checks as would be appropriated in order to localize cancers and other diseases early in order to treat them better. But only very little is happening in this regard. People are actually encouraged to move back to the radioactively contaminated regions because of economic factors: they don't want these regions to become empty. They want to forget this ever happened, they want people to move on and they don't want to admit that this will have health effects in the coming decades. They don't want to admit that people will be suffering from it. And with "they" I mean the Japanese nuclear village politicians behind nuclear energy, the companies behind nuclear energy, the state control organizations which are receiving money from the nuclear industry. All of them are trying to whitewash this catastrophe and UNSCEAR is part of this movement. UNSCEAR is helping them and this is something that we cannot accept as scientists and as doctors that a UN body is actually whitewashing this catastrophe.

LH: (42:44) This is a damning analysis of UNSCEAR and their report. In your estimation is UNSCEAR operating out of a difference of opinion, an alternative interpretation of the data that they are using, or is there an element of outright lying and propaganda on the part of UNSCEAR to protect the nuclear industry?

AR: I think that's a very difficult issue to tackle. You have to see that UNSCEAR is a UN body. And as a UN

body the states that are members of the UN are sending delegates or representatives to this body. So the question is: which states are sending representative? It's the nuclear states, it's the United States, it's Canada, it's Germany, it's Japan, it's India. It's the countries that have nuclear power that have the capacity to have nuclear programs. And obviously these countries have a vested interest in keeping this nuclear power, this nuclear capacity. So they are sending scientists which are coming straight out of their nuclear programs, scientists that have grown up in these nuclear programs, that have made a career in the International Atomic Energy Agency, that have been working for nuclear fuel companies. So these are not people that you would say are critical of nuclear energy. No scientist that has ever published a critical paper on nuclear energy or health effects of ionizing radiation would ever be allowed in UNSCEAR. UNSCEAR is a club of scientists representing the interests of the nuclear states. (44:19) And this is something that people have to be aware of. It's not an independent body of research, it's not a body that is composed of critical scientists on the one hand and pro nuclear scientists on the other hand. It's strictly pronuclear and there are people sitting on UNSCEAR and there are scientists being quoted in their paper who have been working their entire lives for the nuclear industry in their countries.

So I wouldn't go so far as to say that they are lying, they're are doing propaganda. But they have a group think, they are coming from organizations that are very pro nuclear. They have never heard anything different, they have certain bias that they just can't get away from. What's necessary in science, in true science, is that you have different opinions and scientists from different fields arguing with each other and actually testing their hypotheses and testing their opinions against each other so that in the end what comes out is as close to the truth as possible. UNSCEAR is not the right body to do that. UNSCEAR does not allow criticism, does not allow a neutral position. And so, while I wouldn't say UNSCEAR deliberately lies or uses propaganda, I have to say that it's news and it's papers show very clearly who's paying the bill and very clearly where these people are coming from.

LH: (45:41) How has the IPPNW critical analysis been received meeting by the media, has there been any kind of governmental response to it and has it been acknowledged and responded to by UNSCEAR?

AR: That's a very interesting question. We were in contact with UNSCEAR before publishing our paper. We actually – UNSCEAR published a sort of executive summary, a sort of teaser or a preview on their full report at the UN General Assembly last October. And when we read this preview we immediately responded to UNSCEAR and told them: “Well, listen, reading through your paper your executive summary, these are the points, are the issues that we have problems with, these are the points we see critically and do you want to have a dialog with us?”

What they did was, they actually took a lot of our arguments and we find now in the final paper, in the final version some of our wording, some of our arguments but the conclusions – they stay the same. So in our first letter to UNSCEAR we criticized them for sitting in their ivory tower and passing judgment on people far away in other countries without actually looking at their individuals suffering and the individuals situations and just saying: “Don't worry, everything will be fine” – but they don't travel to Fukushima and don't talk to the people up there and ask them how they are feeling. So in their final paper what they say is the same conclusion – “everything will be fine” but they add the sentence that obviously it's very important to realize that people are suffering and to pay close attention to the individual stories of the people on the ground. (47:22) So we see that in a way they responded and have taken up some of our criticism but nothing has changed regarding their conclusions. This is something that we don't expect in any case and we don't expect to make a big dent on this organization of UNSCEAR because obviously they come from backgrounds that don't allow for critical thinking or for critical points regarding nuclear energy. That's not how they make their money, that's not why they are sitting in this position and being flown across the world in this UN body, because they are saying what the governments want them to say.

Regarding the reception that our paper got by the media: there were two large press conferences, one in

New York City in front of the UN together with Human Rights Now and one in Berlin. Both were pretty well visited, we had some TV appearances, we had some news paper articles and radio articles or radio stories regarding our findings.

Overall it's a very scientific and very specific topic and doesn't really go down well in mainstream media. But that wasn't our intention. I think our intention was that this UNSCEAR report will be cited and will be referred to for years to come. People will always say: "Well, in the UNSCEAR report they say this and that." Our point was just that we want to give people an alternative view. We want to say: "Well, it might say so in the UNSCEAR report, but read our criticism and then question if what it says in the UNSCEAR report is really the truth." We don't think that we have the truth in our hands either. We are much too small and much too limited in our resources to be able to do giant research on hundreds and thousands of people in Japan to find out what's actually happened with them. But what we can do as scientists and as doctors and as human beings is to ask critical questions and to ask: "Is this really believable, is this really the truth?" And I think, the journalists that caught this line, who saw that we're just doctors trying to protect our patients, trying to stand up to an industrial lobby which is causing harm to public health, promoting a world that is healthy and free of nuclear contamination, I think these journalists they got it right and were able to spread our message. We hope that in the coming years and decades when people look at the UNSCEAR report they will also find our report and have maybe a more critical or unbiased view of UNSCEAR's findings.

LH: (49:49) What can we do to help bring this important analysis to international attention?

AR: Well, what we're trying to do now is to actually get this criticism to the different UN delegations which will be reviewing UNSCEAR's report at the upcoming General Assembly meeting in October. What every individual, blogger, journalist, everyone who is in the topic can do, is spread this information and say: "Well, here is the UNSCEAR report, you can read it and you can find a lot of information in it and here is a critical analysis of the UNSCEAR report which you can use in addition in order to better understand where the limitations and problems of the UNSCEAR report actually lie."

If someone is able to make this information more widely known, for example through news outlets like your own show or to blogs or Wikipedia articles – I think it's just important for this information to reach people. This might be a student doing research for his class project, this might be a teacher doing research for what he is going to teach his students, this might be politicians or their aids looking for information in order to shape policies, this might be journalists doing background research or just the general public, people who have a nuclear power plant in their close proximity and want to find out what happened in Fukushima. All of these people will profit from an unbiased, from a scientific approach to the UNSCEAR report that is not painted by industrial interest, the interest of a lobby group, a very powerful lobby group, annotated by doctors and scientists with the aim of actually getting a clear picture of the health effects of ionizing radiation as a result of Fukushima fallout.

LH: (51:38) That was Alex Rosen calling in from Berlin. He is a German pediatrician, vice president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War in Germany and former vice chair of the International IPPNW Board of Directors. The Critical Analysis of the UNSCEAR report that he cited was created by the IPPNW and is available in English, German and Japanese translations. All will be linked at the website Nuclear Hotseat <http://www.nuclearhotseat.com/Blog/> under the episode [number 161](#).

Originalquelle: <http://www.nuclearhotseat.com/2027/>

Transcript, Lektorat: www.afaz.at (lo,ak,ho) | August 2014 /v2