Currently, one of the two sites being considered to take all of the country’s high-level nuclear waste indefinitely — at what are misleadingly termed Consolidated Interim Storage Sites [emphasis added] — is in New Mexico and owned by, yes, Holtec. That is indeed where Holtec would like to send the high-level radioactive waste transferred from Pilgrim into its on-site casks. But the liquid waste water left in the fuel pool is what the company wants to dump into the Bay. That’s because it’s clearly the fastest, cheapest, and easiest method. Indeed, Singh bragged about the rapidity of Holtec’s decommissioning activities at Pilgrim, as if speed fills one with confidence. Quite the reverse.

The risks around this greed for speed were already flagged by Union of Concerned Scientists physical scientist Ed Lyman, who told NBC Boston in January, “The danger, of course, is that in their attempt to reduce the costs and timeline for decommissioning, that they will cut corners in a way that might jeopardize public health and safety.”

When questions arose during the May 6 hearing about the safety of Holtec’s onsite radioactive waste storage casks, many said they were not only impermeable to missile attack or a crashing airplane but that one could later “have a barbecue” on top of a cask. Again, the risks of fire and nuclear waste do not make happy company.

Naturally, the Cape Cod fishermen and lobstermen’s associations, along with the Massachusetts Attorney General’s office and area resident organizations, are vehemently opposed to the radioactive water dumping given the impact it could have on their livelihoods.

Bivalves — especially, oysters, clams and mussels — serve as filters for radioactive isotopes and bioaccumulate radiation. Two bills that would endeavor to block Holtec’s plans for dumping radioactive water are making their way through the Massachusetts House and Senate.

However, according to reporting by Cape and Islands, it is not clear that a state ban would be sufficient and the radioactive water dump might still go ahead. “The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has said repeatedly that Holtec is allowed to do so, within federal limits, and needs no further permits,” the publication reported.

— Linda Pentz Gunter is the editor and curator of Beyond Nuclear International.org and the international specialist at Beyond Nuclear.
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The Nuclear Ban Treaty Collaborative has coordinated a nationwide media event to release the statement on June 7, as groups around the country call on news outlets to boost coverage of the TPNW. June 12 marks the 40th anniversary of the largest peace demonstration in U.S. history in 1982, the nuclear disarmament protest that contributed to the end of the cold war — when more than a million people gathered in New York City. A New York-based live-stream by RootsAction.org will serve as a catalyst for grassroots organizing to remember our history and re-imagine our future.

You can get involved by organizing a local event to align with the MSP to the TPNW, which takes place in Buenos Aires, Austria June 21-23 with 60 nations meeting to discuss universalizing the Treaty, assistance to survivors of nuclear weapons use and testing, and environmental remediation of contaminated areas — issues that have never before been addressed by an international treaty.

Nukewatch’s John LaForge will attend the MSP and report “live-stream” from Vienna. Look for the date and time to be determined, sign your organization onto the statement, and watch for action alerts to commemorate the Treaty's bomb test, and the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings at nuclearban treaty.

New Study: Cancer Epidemic Is Result of Internal Fallout Radiation, Grossly Miscalculated

Peer-reviewed report reveals massive errors in radiation protection law and likely cause of global cancer epidemic

By the Low Level Radiation Campaign

A new report by British radiation scientist Christopher Busby shows that current radiation exposure limits are based on a risk model that is totally unsafe when applied to internal irradiation. For the purposes of setting radiation exposure limits for common radioactive materials released to the environment, today’s model is deadly, the study says, and was dishonestly assembled back in the 1950s.

The new paper, “Ionizing radiation and cancer: The failure of the risk model,” was published in the peer-reviewed journal Cancer Treatment and Research Communications. [1] In the paper Dr. Busby, the Scientific Secretary of the European Committee on Radiation Risk (ECRR) in Brussels in 1998. The ECRR risk model was published in 2003 and 2010, and a new version is due this year.

The new study also illuminates the way in which the U.S.-influenced international radiation risk model was constructed between 1956 and 1977. The model still used by regulatory agencies today artificially minimized internal radioactivity across the whole human body in such a way that it could be argued that the radiation’s health effects were vanishingly small. In reality, radiation effects at the DNA level are thousands of times higher than the official model says. Likewise, the incidence of cancers caused by radiation exposure is also thousands of times greater than the failed risk model predicts.

The official risk model, which wrongfully minimizes radiation’s harmfulness, enabled the development of nuclear weapons, nuclear power reactors, and “depleted uranium” weapons. Today’s “Linear No Threshold absorbed dose” model was assembled before the discovery of DNA as the target for radiation health effects, yet has not been seriously altered since then, in spite of scientific evidence which strictly falsifies it. Consequently, atmospheric nuclear weapons tests have resulted in the global cancer epidemic and cancer deaths, among those exposed, the paper explains.

“I have worked for more than 30 years on this issue, and I have been attacked on the internet. My Wikipedia entries are constantly changed by trolls in an inverse war against the idea that internal radiation is very dangerous. I have stuck to the issue and refused to back off, because it is critical for life on the planet,” Busby said. A previous journal article by Busby suggests that the Japanese and Nagasaki bombing was dishonestly manipulated to minimize radiation’s health effects.[2]

Dr. Busby, who was previously Visiting Professor at the University of Ulster, together with Professors Alexey Yablokov, Alice Stewart, Inge Shmitz-Feuerhake, Rosalie Bertell, and Molly Scott Cato, set up the independent European Committee on Radiation Risk (ECRR) in Brussels in 1998. The ECRR risk model was published in 2003 and 2010, and a new version is due this year.

— Linda Pentz Gunter is the editor and curator of Beyond Nuclear International.org and the international specialist at Beyond Nuclear.