

# Answer to Michael Liebreich regarding his pro-nuclear stand

<http://app.c.bloomberg.com/e/es.aspx?s=522772699&e=1122314&el-qTrackId=ff12ddd226f94fab8d68e74a62da2fdf&elq=73d150dc323c4b52a4c313a2098c06f2&el-qaid=19870&elqat=1>

1

Michael, you describe nuclear power as “safe” and “better than coal”. This is an uncomplete picture when cheaper renewables are available, not harming people, faster to build and more efficient against global warming. You correctly write that existing...

2

nukes never paid waste disposal. They neither have a reasonable liability insurance – something any wind or solar facility has no problem with. Prolongation of nuclear power is continued unfair competition at expense of renewables, right?...

3

As an intellectual you must have heard (but precisely ignore) controversies on victim numbers. Russian sources collected in *Annals Of The New York Academy Of Sciences (Volume 1181, 2009)* <http://bit.ly/2Wszf8B> put the Chernobyl dead headcount at 1 million people:

4

“The overall mortality for the period from April 1986 to the end of 2004 from the Chernobyl catastrophe was estimated at 985,000 additional deaths” (p. 210)...The number of Chernobyl victims will continue to grow in the next several generations (p.211).

5

You instead cite “officials” from UNSCEAR. IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) and UNSCEAR (United Nations Scientific Committee on Atomic Radiation): “only 32 deaths occurred, 200 were heavily irradiated and 2000 avoidable thyroid cancers”. <http://bit.ly/2LHY8vq>

6

Medical doctors in Ukraine and Belarus opposed this greenwashing, pointing to the fact that IAEA has a statutory mandate to promote nuclear power. At Kiev Conference 2001 Dr. Alexey Yablokov, President of the Centre for Political Ecology of the Russian Federation,...

7

claimed that UNSCEAR data had been falsified by the State Committee for Statistics, and the officials were arrested in 1999 for this crime. He charged that UNSCEAR used falsified data to support its claims of minimization of harm. <http://bit.ly/2LHY8vq>

8

“...more than seven million of our fellow human beings do not have the luxury of forgetting. They are still suffering, everyday, as a result of what happened . . .The exact number of victims can never be known. But three million children demanding treatment until 2016 and...

9

earlier represents the number of those who can be seriously ill...their future life will be deformed by it, as well as their childhood. Many will die prematurely.” (Annals p.2)

10

Statements by The World Health Organization (WHO) have been controlled and censored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). There is a WHO/IAEA agreement, signed May 28<sup>th</sup> 1959 (Resolution WHA 12.40) that proscribes

11

independent WHO initiatives in nuclear matters without prior IAEA agreement: article 1 § 3 of the agreement states that in order to engage in a program in a domain which constitutes a major interest for the IAEA, WHO must consult the IAEA "with a view to adjusting the matter by mutual agreement".

12

This pact is in blatant contradiction with article 37 of WHO constitution: "In the performance of their duties the Director-General and the staff (of WHO) shall not seek or receive instructions (...) from any authority external to the Organization".

13

Conventional sources such as Wikipedia (<http://bit.ly/2LOVBPO>) deliver data that 500,000 – 800,000 young soldiers (“liquidators”) were forced to clean up the highly radioactive Chernobyl area: «Liquidators worked under deplorable conditions,...

14

poorly informed and with poor protection. Many, if not most of them, exceeded radiation safety limits» and after were sent back home all over the Sowjetunion. They never got treatment state of the art and they were not counted in epidemiological statistics.

15

There is another ugly bias in your BNEF nuclear propaganda editorial, regarding Denmark. You say that Denmark needs 6,100 wind turbines to produce 13.9 TWh, comparable to Isar 2 nuke in Bavaria with 11.5 TWh. The numbers are correct. But...

16

The suggestion that you need thousands of wind turbines is wrong. Denmark has the oldest inventory of old, small, least productive engines. If you would take new Vestas 9.5 MW offshore turbines a couple of hundreds turbine can do it, built within months.

17

It's no secret that German coal exit will be accomplished many years before the "2038". A continuation of coal use under EU-emissions-trading-regime would be costly and stupid therefore. Once compensations of the coal phase out law are cashed in the polluters will happily leave the playground.

18

I bet my wallet (actually 300\$) that German coal phase out will happen before 2030. Usually right wing German Industry Chamber BDI (Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie) is asking for acceleration of renewable's investments by additional 1.6-2.3 billion

19

or "at least 6 GW" per year. <http://bit.ly/2JpLq1m>. They find out that with a purely renewable strategy "net cost will be a black zero". Maybe they should tell US GOP.

20

After all we all know now that Michael Liebreich has a nuclear agenda and similar to nuclear sceptics who I am we do not change easily our minds. But it is clear who will win. It is like typewriters against PCs or trains against stagecoaches. I prefer trains ;-)