

1: The Health Costs of Nuclear Technology

The nuclear workers and scientists who tell their stories in this book testify to the lie that has been sold to the American people. Nuclear energy is not safe, not clean, not cheap.

Friedman graduated from Linden High School and the University of Chicago, earning a Bachelor of Science in and a Master of Science degree in nuclear physics in . Since then, he has given lectures at more than colleges and to more than professional groups in 50 states, 10 provinces, and 19 countries outside the US. He has published more than 80 UFO-related papers and has appeared on many radio and television programs. I am interested in the latter, not the former. House of Representatives that the evidence suggests that Earth is being visited by intelligently controlled extraterrestrial vehicles. In , after researching and fact checking the Majestic 12 documents, Friedman said that there was no substantive grounds for dismissing their authenticity. Astronomer Marjorie Fish constructed a three-dimensional map of nearby sun-like stars and claimed a good match from the perspective of Zeta Reticuli, about 39 light years distant. Friedman contests the implicit premise of SETI that there has been no extraterrestrial visitation of the planet, because it is his claim that SETI is seeking only signals, not extraterrestrial intelligence or beings. He maintains that the prominence and widespread public claims of those involved with SETI have tended to prevent serious research, including research by journalists, of UFOs. Public and scientific opinion[edit] Friedman says of the response to his talks, "I know that most people are unfamiliar with the several large-scale scientific studies Friedman refers to the following data in support of his position: With respect to scientists, a poll was taken by Industrial Research and Development in and . Of the rest of this subgroup, approximately half believed them to be natural phenomena and half were "undecided". Peter Sturrock also polled the membership of the American Astronomical Society and found that "the greater the amount of time one spent on reading UFO-related material, the more likely one is to accept their reality" p. Friedman is outspoken in his articulation of positions and in his criticism of UFO debunkers, often stating he is not an "apologist ufologist". His positions are regarded as controversial in mainstream science and media, but Friedman claims to have received little opposition at his many lectures, most of which have been at colleges and universities, many to engineering societies and other groups of physicists [2] p. Friedman has been criticized both by skeptics and other Roswell researchers for taking the position that there are no substantive grounds for dismissing the authenticity of some Majestic 12 documents. Friedman himself was the first to provide evidence that some of the documents are clearly hoaxes. Friedman has researched the MJ documents since first becoming aware of them from William Moore and Jaime Shandera in . As an example, Philip J. He adopted three children with his first wife and had one daughter with his second wife, Marilyn.

2: Strategies for Dissenting Scientists

*Nuclear Witnesses: Insiders Speak Out [Leslie J. Freeman] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. "This is a fascinating and frightening book. In vivid taped interviews, sixteen individuals who have been close to some aspect of nuclear power tell of the experiences that turned them into bitter opponents.*

Stanton Friedman; A commentary. The book Crash at Corona states on the flyleaf: This sparked a return volley from Stanton, and this counter from Brad. There are some very disturbing claims made in the book Crash at Corona. The authors place great emphasis on this excerpt from the Twining Letter: It is at best deliberately misleading, and at worst totally dishonest. When discussing this quote, Friedman quite conveniently omits that the Twining letter states that this is only an opinion: It is the opinion that: The phenomenon is something real and not visionary or fictitious. Had the Air Force indeed been in possession of a crashed interplanetary craft- as Friedman claims- Twining would surely have commented on it. The Twining letter further states that "It is possible within the present U. Unless, of course, the "alien spaceship" used technology. While there remains the possibility of Russian manufacture, based on perspective thinking and actual accomplishments of the Germans, it is the considered opinion of some elements that the object may in fact represent an interplanetary craft of some kind. There are two problems with this. First if a spaceship was recovered by the Air Force at Roswell as Friedman asserts , then the Air Force would not bother with possibilities. Second, the real document says something totally different! Friedman does state that Smith has showed signs of "mental disturbance" but claims that was only later. He used to sit in his orchard at home with a tape recorder, so when the Space Brothers Topside came down so he could interview them. The Smith memorandum is not considered to be a real top secret document worthy of study by very many people in UFOlogy. Friedman mentions that the memo was checked with Sarbacher. Barnett is long dead and was never interviewed by Friedman. He used only supposed second hand statements- hearsay. Gerald Anderson, who can be read about in his own section on the Roswell witnesses, later was disowned by Friedman. It is not a pretty story! Friedman has since repudiated his repudiation of Anderson! He now claims that Don Berliner, his co-author of Crash at Corona, wrote the original comments disowning Gerald Anderson, but now he- Stanton Friedman, disagrees with Don on this point. Stanton now says that he still trusts Gerald, although he says he is "disappointed" that Gerald got caught hoaxing a document. The MJ documents only list one alien spaceship crash and places it far from the Plains of San Agustin, where Anderson and the Barnett stories put it. This point is usually hidden or glossed over by Mr. Crash at Corona also claims that "Majestic is quite possibly the single most important key to the entire UFO mystery. TV producers no longer feel obliged to have "Noisy Negativists" appear "for decoration at the end of the show. Friedman makes these comments even though he knows full well that there is probably no UFO info in the NSA documents, just as he is fully aware of comments made by Tom Deuley. Tom Deuley worked at NSA for 4 years in the mids. Though there may have been exceptions among the documents that I did not see, none of the documents I was aware of had any information of scientific value. Later, NSA re-released the same documents with the majority of the documents not blocked out. It turns out, in many cases, that when the Soviets would use the term "unidentifiable object", the NSA translators would use the term UFO. They also added "Probably a balloon" after most of these comments, referring to Soviet radar calibration balloons. These are Communication Intelligence reports. The reports indicate the station that made the report, and could give the Soviets information on which transmitters we were listening and what we know about their actions. The main sections still blacked out are those about the locale of where the reports were made. Here are some formerly blacked out sections in the re-released NSA documents: One item of interest is that Friedman himself is mentioned, indirectly, in the NSA documents! Friedman had pushed a Cuban UFO report that was supposedly picked up by radio as real. Since it was reported to have been picked up by radio, it was investigated by the NSA and found to be phony! To the best of my knowledge, Friedman has never addressed his being mentioned in the NSA documents in any of his presentations about UFOs. After all, I was a nuclear physicist for Westinghouse".

3: This Atom Bomb in Me | Lindsey A. Freeman

Leslie J. Freeman is the author of Nuclear Witnesses (avg rating, 0 ratings, 0 reviews).

September, 02, - Following is the full text of the interview. It seems that Trump is looking for pretexts to scuttle the deal. Do you believe so? There have been a number of personnel changes from the White House. Some of the most aggressive promoters of confrontation with Iran, such as Michael Flynn and Steve Bannon, are no longer in the Administration. I do not think the President is looking for a pretext to cancel the agreement, but I do think he wants assurances that the stipulations in the agreement are being met, in order to satisfy the critics that are calling for a cancellation. Reports suggest that President Trump, frustrated that his national security aides have not given him any options on how the United States can leave the Iran nuclear deal, has instructed them to find a rationale for declaring that the country is violating the terms of the accord. What do you think? There have been no documented violations of the nuclear accord by the US, the UN, or the other parties to the agreement. Tension arises around missile technology and missile tests, and this is, in a certain way, a gray area of the agreement. All rocket and space technology is dual use. Iran, as a sovereign state, is entirely entitled to pursue a space program, as it has done. To have included in the nuclear agreement a stipulation that rockets capable of carrying a nuclear warhead would be banned created an ambiguity. This can only be clarified through discussions and coming to an understanding of what is a violation. Neither side can make up rules as it goes along. American officials have reportedly told allies they should be prepared to join in reopening negotiations with Iran or expect that the United States may abandon the agreement, as it did the Paris climate accord. And according to several foreign officials, the United States has begun raising with international inspectors in Vienna the possibility of demanding access to military sites in Iran. Why is the new administration seeking to bring to the negotiating table again? How do you think Iran and other parties to the deal should react? I think Iran should react to these instigations with an abundance of patience, as the policy is still in flux. As in the case with other sensitive and contentious international issues, public statements and private discussions can be quite different. I think that unlike the Paris climate accord, there are people who recognize that the Iran nuclear agreement is a strategic policy commitment, with many strategic consequences, should it be cancelled. I believe that global strategic and economic relationships are changing. The Belt and Road initiative from China, involving the participation of more than 60 nations, will supersede the dominance of the United States and Europe as the world driver of economic, political, and scientific development. Iran is an important element in this global infrastructure initiative. The future for the US and other legacy industrial nations will depend upon their joining and contributing to this world-wide project. It will be within that context that the relations among nations will be defined.

4: Nuclear Witnesses: Insiders Speak Out () by Leslie J. Freeman

Nuclear Witnesses: Insiders Speak Out by Leslie J. Freeman "This is a fascinating and frightening book. In vivid taped interviews, sixteen individuals who have been close to some aspect of nuclear power tell of the experiences that turned them into bitter opponents.

It is the attempt to deceive the public that makes him so angry. His reaction was the same when he learned how the Atomic Energy Commission was deceiving the public about the effects of low-level radiation. When the AEC tried to censor his findings about radiation-induced cancers, Gofman reached his turning point. To him, censorship is "the descent of darkness. Then I started hearing that there were a lot of people from the electric utility industry who were insulting us and our work. They were saying our cancer calculations from radiation were ridiculous, that they were poorly based scientifically, that there was plenty of evidence that we were wrong. So I wondered what was going on there. It was stupid not to have thought about it. I just wondered, Why is the electric utility industry attacking us? I began to look at all the ads that I had just cursorily seen in "Newsweek" and "Time" and "Life," two-page spreads from the utilities, talking about their wonderful nuclear power program. And it was all going to be done "safely," because they were never going to give radiation above the safe threshold. It looked like sound science. We need our nuclear power program, and unless we destroy Gofman and Tamplin, the nuclear power program is in real hazard from what they say. But if you read the fine print, they were admitting that we might just be right. By then the AEC had gotten themselves into another flap. This further damaged the credibility of the AEC. Those two events—the conflict with Ford and Kendall and the conflict with us—finally led them to realize they could no longer use the words "Atomic Energy Commission," and so the government abolished the AEC. The new NRC was only supposed to involve itself in safety—no promotion. Which turned out to be one of the greatest lies in history. I had made one mistake. They need you—with your scientific prestige—so they can point to you. But if you want the money and the continued support, you should go fishing or play golf. My mistake was I discovered something. Gofman decided to take an early retirement at the age of fifty-five, so he gave up his position at the University in and became professor emeritus. Although no longer engaged in active teaching, Gofman did not give up research. In the next years he discovered that plutonium was even more hazardous than he had thought. The requirement for controlling plutonium in a nuclear economy built on breeder reactors would be to lose no more than one millionth or ten millionth of all the plutonium that is handled into the environment where it could get to people. Which brings up a fundamental thing in nuclear energy—there are some engineers, scientists, who are not merely fraudulent sycophants of the system. I was once on an airplane with a strong pronuclear engineer. At what toxicity would you give up nuclear power? Now their mistakes catch up with them, as you see from the DCs and the Tacoma Narrows Bridge that fell down, and the Teton Dam and the most recent episode, Three Mile Island—where the unthinkable, the impossible, did happen. A Simple Question Many people think nuclear power is so complicated it requires discussion at a high level of technicality. Because the issue is simple and straightforward. There are only two things about nuclear power that you need to know. One, why do you want nuclear power? So you can boil water. And any way of boiling water will give you steam to turn turbines. The other thing to know is, it creates a mountain of radioactivity, and I mean a mountain: And the whole thing about nuclear power is this simple: You not only need to control it from the public, you also need to control it from the workers. Because the dose that federal regulations allow workers to get is sufficient to create a genetic hazard to the whole human species. You have two choices: It is not a question any more: The only way you could license nuclear power plants and not have murder is if you could guarantee perfect containment. They allow workers to get irradiated, and they have an allowable dose for the population. I view this as a disgrace, as a public health disgrace. You must decide what your views are on this: If so, why do you worry about homicide? People like myself and a lot of the atomic energy scientists in the late fifties deserve Nuremberg trials. At Nuremberg we said those who participate in human experimentation are committing a crime. But once you know that your nuclear power plants are going to release radioactivity and kill a certain number of people, you are no longer committing the crime of

experimentationâ€”you are committing a higher crime. The only solution is, you must stop all efforts to develop first-strike force solutions everywhereâ€”whether they be nuclear or otherâ€”and move toward a more just society. Even if you made an agreement to abolish all nuclear weapons, but you left established power structure in the U. My view is, there exists a group of people in the world that have a disease. I call it the "power disease. They are a more important plague than cancer, pneumonia, bubonic plague, tuberculosis, and heart disease put together. They can only think how to obliterate, control, and use each other. There are fifty million people a year being consumed in a nutritional holocaust around the world; nobody gives a damn about starvation. In my opinion, what we need is to move toward being nauseated by people who want to be at the top, in power. Can you think of anything more ridiculous than that the Chinese, Russian, and American people let their governments play with superlethal toys and subject all of us to these hazards? The solution is not to replace one leader with another or to have more government. Society has to reorganize itself. First, a doctor tried to convince me to take radioactive iodine for an overactive thyroid. Several months later John Gofman told me I was very fortunate. The radioactive iodine, he explained, would have increased the chance of my getting cancer by more than percent. The other thing that led me to write this book was the accident at Three Mile Island. Coincidentally, my thyroid condition had been diagnosed the same week that Three Mile Island vented radioactive gases into the atmosphere. I read everything I could lay my hands on, groping for the truth behind the evasive reports published by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The words these men said to each other stunned me. They had no idea what was happening and no idea how to stop it. And meanwhile they were issuing reassuring reports to the public. I wanted the truth. For the first time I felt my survival was at stakeâ€”nuclear power was not an abstract issue: I started to talk to peopleâ€”scientists, doctors, nuclear workers. I interviewed twenty-four people who have worked with or around nuclear materials. Most interviews took between two and four hours and were followed up by phone interviews. I taped the in-person and telephone interviews and listened to them several times, taking notes. I then selected and transcribed those which I felt contained the clearest and most important information and were also the most fascinating as narratives. These were the transcripts from which I worked for the chapters of this book. A word about the editing I did. In every case I tried to maintain the exact words, the exact flavor of the speech, and the exact meaning intended by the speaker. I have cut out sections that were redundant, irrelevant, unnecessary, or confusing. The repetitive "you know" or "like I said" was eliminated when it seemed too distractingâ€”appropriate perhaps in conversation but not on the page. Each chapter was returned to the narrator in draft form for comments, accuracy, and approval. In some cases a name was changed to protect an informant, an expression was changed, a statistic was corrected. The final version of each chapter was then writtenâ€”including an introductory section, footnotes, and a bibliography of sources relevant to the chapter. Each narrator was also asked for a photograph to include with his or her chapter. The question that I asked initially in each interview was about personal background. This was followed by a series of questions about what experiences the person had which made him or her change or develop a point of view on nuclear power. I did not merely listen. When I did not understand, I asked questions. When I did not believe something, I said so. I asked for proof, for reasons, for the thoughts and feelings which made people act the way they did. I asked them to describe experiences in such a way that I could see what they saw and hear what people said and did. They described specific hearings and meetings. Again and again I asked to be told what went through their minds as they experienced the things they told me about. It was these personal moments that most brought me into their lives and that I have attempted to bring to the reader. It is the premise of this book that if the American people knew the truth about radiation there would be no nuclear issue. The information speaks for itself.

5: Nuclear suppression

Chapters from Nuclear Witnesses, by Leslie Freeman, Chapters Deadly Deceit, Low-Level Radiation, High-Level Coverup, Dr. Ernest Sternglass: Secret Fallout, Low-Level Radiation from Hiroshima to Three Mile Island, book and Phone Interview.

Unfortunately with the current focus on reducing greenhouse gases, there is a dangerous potential to turn to nuclear power because it may not directly contribute to carbon emissions. Nuclear power does however indirectly contribute to carbon emissions because of the mining, transportation, and processing that nuclear fuel involves. What Can We Do? Once aware of the potential sources of ionizing radiation you may be exposed to, do your best to reduce total exposure. Also ensure that you are "nutrient sufficient" to minimize uptake of radioactive elements that may be lurking in air, food, and water. Reduce Exposure The most obvious solution to reducing internal exposure to radiation would be to reduce external exposure. Of course avoiding or at least minimizing exposure is paramount but may be difficult when some exposure is out of our control. Although it is nearly impossible to assess uptake and storage of radioactive elements without full analysis of tissue, bones, or teeth, the EPA has created an algorithm for attempting to estimate ongoing radiation exposure. Exposure to X-rays, especially CT scans should be minimized or avoided if possible. Minimize air travel as much as possible. Avoid living within 20 miles of a nuclear facility or coal-fired plant; avoid food and water that may be contaminated by facility activities. Have drinking and well water tested for radon and other contamination. Many radioactive elements, including Sr, can be removed from water via reverse osmosis or distillation. Avoid exposure to UV light from tanning beds [] or even excessive exposure from the sun. Remember stratospheric ozone protects us from solar radiation but this protection is diminished as the ozone layer is depleted. Consume a nutrient-dense diet and supplement as needed to maintain tissue saturation of essential nutrients i. Selective Uptake Selective uptake is based on the principle that in the presence of nutrient sufficiency, radioactive elements will not be absorbed as extensively as they would be in the face of nutrient deficiency. The principle applies to plants and humans. Nutrients applied to the soil can reduce uptake of radioactive elements by plants e. In fact, research indicates that being deficient in vitamins and minerals e. The principle of selective uptake is employed by the FDA in their guidelines for potassium iodide KI administration in the event of a nuclear accident. Protective Foods Plant-based foods top the list of radio-protective foods due to their abundance of phytonutrients aka phytochemicals that possess antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and immunomodulatory properties. Antioxidants protect us against the oxidizing effects of free radicals and therefore may reduce the damage caused by ionizing radiation and radioactive elements. Several phytonutrients and their sources have been researched for their ability to protect cells from radiation damage including holy basil, carotenoids e. Healthy foods high in calcium [] can help block strontium uptake, including organic dairy products, almonds, collard and turnip greens, blackstrap molasses, spinach, and sardines and salmon with the bone in. Foods high in potassium [] are also important; baked sweet and white potatoes, tomato paste, white beans, carrot juice, bananas, and spinach are good examples. You can plan for and prepare your own healthy snacks. Incorporate fruits, vegetables, nuts, seeds, whole grains, herbs, and spices into quick breads, muffins, cereals, and even make up a daily "nibble tray". William Sears has great success promoting nibble trays to his young patients [] but even adolescents and adults would benefit from a healthy, easy-to-reach nibble tray! Clinical research is being conducted on a whole-food based bar CHORI-bar that provides micronutrients and antioxidants and supports our natural antioxidant mechanisms as well. A pectin-vitamin supplement was found to significantly reduce body burden of radioactive strontium and cesium in animal studies. However, when nutrient needs are increased or radiation exposure is elevated, targeted nutrition supplementation may be indicated. Taking a high-quality supplement that provides antioxidants e. Be sure to choose the natural form of folate 5-MTHF and not synthetic folic acid. See tables Protective Factors in Radiation Exposure and Protective Supplements in Radiation Exposure for more information on protective foods and supplements. Nutrient deficiency can be detrimental while nutrient sufficiency and saturation have protective effects. Fruits and vegetables in general tend to be the most alkalizing foods, while sugar, meat,

dairy, fried foods, and trans-fats are most acid-forming. Antioxidants and Phytonutrients Antioxidants: Phytonutrients from plant-based sources: B-complex, glutathione, branched-chain amino acids, flavonoids, phospholipids. Vitamins C and E, selenium, copper, zinc, manganese, CoQ10, thiols, bioflavonoids, silymarin, pycnogenol. Fiber Insoluble cellulose, lignin and soluble pectins, gums, gels fiber plays an important role in radioprotection. Fiber adds bulk, speeds gastrointestinal transit time, absorbs toxicants, and promotes the growth of protective, probiotic bacteria. Herbs and Spices Herbs and spices are rich sources of antioxidants and phytonutrients that can inhibit carcinogen formation and activation, upregulate phase II detoxification enzymes, inhibit oxidation and inflammation, and demonstrate anti-tumor activity. Legumes contain minerals, chelating-phytates and radioprotective protease inhibitors. Sesamol from sesame seeds was also found to be radioprotective and exhibited a free-radical scavenging capacity 20 times that of melatonin. Seaweed also contains radioprotective pectin. Supplementing with sodium alginate from kelp and other sea vegetables was found to have a profound radioprotective effect as it blocks intestinal absorption and bone uptake of radioactive strontium, and increases Sr excretion without interfering with calcium metabolism. Calcium blocks Sr; Cobalamin blocks cobalt; Iodine blocks iodine; Iron blocks plutonium ; Potassium blocks cesium; Sulfur blocks sulfur; Zinc blocks zinc Vegetables Vegetables contain fiber, minerals, phytonutrients, and antioxidants. The Brassicaceae family broccoli, cabbage, collard, kale, watercress, cauliflower, Brussels sprouts, radish, etc. Reverse osmosis, distillation, and ion exchange can remove radionuclides. Whole Grains Whole grains, as tolerated, provide vitamins, minerals, fiber, and phytates which bind radionuclides but can also bind nutritive minerals. Protective Supplements in Radiation Exposure Adaptogens Adaptogens astragalus, ashwagandha, ginseng, eleutherococcus, schizandra, rhodiola, maitake and reishi mushrooms, holy basil, and boerhaavia diffusa exert radioprotective effects and modulate neuroendocrine-immune communication. AGE AGE Aged Garlic Extract protects against ionizing radiation, scavenges reactive oxygen species, enhances cellular antioxidant enzymes and cellular glutathione, protects DNA from free-radical damage, and inhibits multi-step carcinogenesis. SODs utilize the essential minerals copper, zinc, manganese, and iron. Glutathione, a tri-peptide produced endogenously from glutamic acid, glycine, and cysteine, is also available in IV, topical, and oral form as stable s-acetyl glutathione. Glutathione and MnSOD are particularly protective against ionizing radiation. Radiation and heavy metal exposure, stress, infection, and temperature changes increase requirements. For optimal health, Dr. Beta-glucans stimulate hematopoiesis following ionizing radiation, [] stimulate immune cells, and down-regulate immunosuppressive cells. Chlorella should be consumed in "broken cell wall" form to enhance its bioavailability. Joseph Mercola recommends at least 4 g daily from uncontaminated sources combined with fresh cilantro for a synergistic effect. Flaxseeds were found to mitigate the negative effects of radiation, including inflammation, pulmonary fibrosis, and cytokine secretion. Eating omega-3 rich seafood or consuming 2 g of high-quality fish oil is recommended several times per week by the Linus Pauling Institute at OSU. Genistein Genistein, a phytonutrient found in soybeans, exerts radioprotective, antioxidant, and anti-tumor effects [] Genistein applied following radiation was found to mitigate oxidative damage, lung fibrosis, and pneumonitis. Cordyceps, gotu kola, milk thistle, and alpha lipoic acid have been shown to increase glutathione production. Melatonin Melatonin, produced primarily in the pineal gland from serotonin, possesses radioprotective and antioxidant properties in addition to its role in circadian rhythm regulation. Recommended doses range from 0. It will absorb both. KI potassium iodide blocks radioactive iodine from entering the thyroid. Protective mechanisms include "cellular differentiation and communication, Programmed Cell Death PCD apoptosis and autophagy and antiangiogenesis Few foods contain vitamin D and supplementation may be indicated. Both natural and synthetic zeolites have been utilized in the removal of radionuclides from biological tissues as well as from water supply systems. This information is not a substitute for acute medical advice. Resources and General References.

6: Stanton Friedman and The Roswell UFO Incident

The following is chapter 4 from the paperback edition of the book Nuclear Witnesses, Insiders Speak Out and is an interview with Dr. John Gofman detailing his personal experiences and knowledge regarding the nuclear establishment.

It is not possible for one author to investigate thoroughly every claim, but the quality and quantity of cases cited here suggest grounds for concern. In December, Sharma was suddenly transferred to the School of Languages, thus formally preventing him from further science policy studies. My object here is to describe the Sharma-JNU case in the context of the nuclear issue and other similar cases. Suppression of expert dissent on nuclear issues can be seen as a predictable consequence of the way nuclear technology has been linked to political and economic institutions. No satisfactory official explanation has been given for the transfer. Since there are no apparent academic or other grounds, suppression seems to be the best explanation. There are a number of points to be made in support of this. His position there was associate professor. The transfer was in apparent violation of the conditions of his appointment. Second, the executive council of JNU passed a regulation in requiring that there be consultation with the staff member concerned before any transfer occur. Thus the university acted in violation of its own regulations. Third, Sharma has an impressive academic record. In his time at JNU, he has been a leading figure in science policy research, publishing over 50 papers in Indian and international journals. He played a major role in promoting the advanced degree programme and attracting visiting scholars. He also acted as head of the Centre for a year. Since then, international pressure seems to have restrained the development of nuclear weapons in India. Nevertheless, the nuclear establishment in India is powerful. Sharma tells of large-scale economic waste due to the tight linking of interests among the Department of Atomic Energy, the Atomic Energy Commission of India, and the Ministry of Defence, a network which lacks any effective oversight. Sharma documents the role of the Tata group of industries and the Larsen and Toubro Company in obtaining major orders on nuclear projects, and the tight links between individuals in this operation. Sharma does not hesitate to name names. It seems no coincidence that his transfer came not long after the publication of his book. As well as his publications critical of Indian nuclear policy, Sharma convenes the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. This has organised conferences, printed articles, presented petitions and otherwise played an important role in questioning official policy. Sharma would have been the most senior member of staff in the Centre and therefore, most likely, its head. This would have added to his stature and to the influence of his criticisms. Furthermore, he was due to be promoted to full professor, and as such would have become an ex officio member of key decision-making bodies in the university. It must be conceded that, on the non-nuclear front, Sharma had antagonised members of the JNU hierarchy by his vocal support for student and staff rights during disturbances in May, when the university took harsh steps against dissident students and staff. Sharma was one of the staff members who took a forthright public stand against the administration. But unlike Sharma, other staff who openly supported the students were not victimised. Sharma has made appeals for reconsideration and so forth, but these have been denied after long delays, again with no reasons given. In the absence of any official explanation, it seems at least plausible to infer that Sharma is being victimised for being effective in criticising nuclear and academic policies. Expertise and the nuclear state Nuclear programmes throughout the world have been the creatures of states. The military is the key bastion of state power, [8,9] and hence nuclear weapons programmes have always been tightly controlled by the elites in military establishments, both civilian and military. To develop and apply nuclear technology for war, scientists and technologists have had to be drawn into the service of the state. This began on a large scale in the United States with the Manhattan project, which is widely seen as the beginning of the major connection between government and science there. The knowledge and skills of scientists and technologists have been utilised by states, [10] but the scientists and technologists have not been passive pawns in the process. They control a vital resource: By making that knowledge selectively useful to militaries, they have tailored their services for their patrons. However, they maintain some degree of independence, especially by asserting the importance of specialist knowledge in policy-making. For example, top administrators at the US Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories have promoted new

developments in nuclear war-fighting and hindered negotiations for a comprehensive test ban, [11] relying in each case on their alleged monopoly on an expert knowledge which cannot be penetrated by outsiders. State elites and elite nuclear scientists have a joint interest in maintaining nuclear knowledge as the preserve of the experts and the policy-makers. In practice, this means preventing members of the general public from obtaining an unsympathetic critical understanding of nuclear issues, and thereby claiming some degree of oversight or veto over nuclear developments. A clear expression of elite opposition to the spreading of nuclear knowledge to the general public in the USA was the attempted suppression of the publication of "The secret of the H-bomb" by the Progressive. This article by Howard Morland describes the basic principle which makes possible the construction of thermonuclear weapons. It is not as if this were a secret from the Soviet Union, nor from any other assiduous investigator; the basic idea had been presented openly before, including in an encyclopaedia article by Edward Teller. This secrecy was justified in part by the claim that a high level of expertise was needed to understand and comment on the issues, and also by the contradictory claim that there were vital yet simple secrets which could not be revealed lest they get into the wrong hands. The US government, in an unprecedented move, put a prior restraining order on publication. Significantly, numerous leading scientists supported the suppression attempt. The symbiotic link between the nuclear state and nuclear scientists was being threatened. First, the very great capital investment in the nuclear fuel cycle means that a strong financial and bureaucratic interest is built, which cannot be easily overcome even should other energy paths become more attractive. These political controls in turn often lead to attacks on civil liberties, including the rights of opponents of nuclear power. Suppression In the debates and struggle over nuclear technology, the promoters have used their monopoly over nuclear knowledge to claim that they should have the final say. Opponents have argued that the key issues are not technical but rather social, political and economic. This response has had only limited impact so long as nuclear expertise remains unchallenged. One of the responses to such counter-experts is attempts to suppress them. This can take such forms as blocking publications, refusing permission to give talks, refusing or withdrawing funds and staff, job transfers, sacking, blacklisting and character assassination. Instead of responding to the arguments of the critical expert, the individual is attacked personally. Seldom is dissidence itself openly acknowledged as the reason for the suppression. The first essential element in suppression is an act of dissidence, such as a speech, letter, report or research programme which threatens the practices or legitimacy of a powerful group such as a corporation, a state bureaucracy or a profession. The second essential element is an action by that powerful group, or by someone acting in its interests, to attack the dissident or to prevent freedom of speech or inquiry. Suppression of intellectual dissent is a widespread phenomenon, found in a host of fields and organisational situations. Needless to say, under military rule or state socialism, the opportunities to dissent are even more restricted. The study of suppression of intellectual dissent is an undeveloped and disorganised area. Here I list a number of cases in the nuclear area which seem to fit the category of suppression: The view that suppression is involved in a great many of these cases draws strength from the common pattern of events and its congruence with the theoretical explanation of suppression. Only thumbnail sketches of cases are included here. Some of these cases may turn out to have other interpretations but, as a whole, I hope they cause some general alarm bells to ring. Australia The Australian Atomic Energy Commission in May withdrew permission which had been granted earlier for two of its officials to address the Society for Social Responsibility in Science on the future of nuclear power in Australia. The Chairman of the Commission, Sir Philip Baxter, called the Society "an organisation heavily tinged with a particular political philosophy" which he was not prepared to assist in any way. At the Institute, he set up an environmental mutagens testing unit, and sometimes provided information to workers on hazards. In , he was sacked from his position. After a court case was begun, in which none of the alleged reasons for the dismissal were established, an agreement was reached by which the Institute said Dr Coulter had been retrenched. He has been a leading public figure on a range of environmental issues for many years, including French nuclear testing in the atmosphere in the early s, uranium mining and nuclear power, environmental impacts on health, and fluoridation. Although no hard evidence is available to prove it, many people believe the transfer was politically inspired. Britain A number of employees of the British nuclear industry have lost or resigned their jobs after suffering harassment because, after trying to

voice their criticisms internally, they raised them in public. Trevor Brown, a scientist in the nuclear industry since , in the s became a Liberal councillor and became involved in safety issues on behalf of constituents. After criticising conditions at Aldermaston, a nuclear research establishment, on the BBC in , he was severely reprimanded for the "public expression of views on official matters". He decided to retire early in , after being threatened with a transfer. In , he was invited to give a talk at a conference concerning the Sizewell reactor. He refused to allow the Authority to examine the talk, and so did not attend the conference; at the same time, management claimed his work was ineffectual. Feeling that he was being unfairly treated, he retired early. In the early s, he began warning that a proposed sale of plutonium to the United States could lead to nuclear weapons proliferation. Because he used his laboratory address and official notepaper in a letter to The Times, he was disciplined by the CEGB. Hesketh claimed that his statements led to months of harassment in his job. After he appeared making these claims on BBC radio, Hesketh was brought before a committee of inquiry and told to bring his work into line. Soon afterwards, he was told he was being transferred to a new job. Hesketh refused the transfer, seeing it as a demotion and as stemming from his public statements concerning plutonium. After making his views about his transfer known to the media, he was formally found guilty at a disciplinary hearing of breaching CEGB employee regulations. In June , Hesketh was dismissed by the CEGB, according to them for refusing to accept the transfer, according to Hesketh because he had embarrassed the nuclear industry through his questioning of official statements about civilian and military uses of nuclear materials. These reports were rejected by British Nuclear Fuels. After threatening to publicly disclose his evidence that workers were being exposed to unnecessary radiation, he was transferred. As a result, he resigned in . It was blowing across city streets, and this constituted a serious health hazard. The President of the Atomic Energy Control Board informed him that a protest was being sent to the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons, suggesting disciplinary action be taken for the "unjustified and scurrilous allegations by a person whose professional standing prompts the public to accept as factual such statements. The suppression of anti-nuclear scientists takes place in this wider context of the political vetting of applicants for government jobs, and the political use of criminal law and the police. Ingo Focke, a Bremen engineer who refused to approve inadequate valves for a nuclear reactor, suspects that his automobile was tampered with to make it dangerous to drive. He knows of other cases of suspected sabotage of vehicles of opponents of nuclear power. As a result, his job responsibilities were curtailed and he was subjected to a smear campaign. Scheer oriented his department towards a study of interactions between science, technology and society and in May the department published a book containing critical perspectives on nuclear issues.

7: Tracking & Mitigating Radiation Poisoning from the Inside Out

I unreservedly recommend Nuclear Witnesses for supporters and opponents of nuclear power and for those who haven't made up their minds. Benjamin Spock, M.D. The nuclear workers and scientists who tell their stories in this book testify to the lie that has been sold to the American people.

Historical and pictorial review, Fort Bragg, NC, Germ Warfare Research for Vietnam. Project SpiceRack on the Pennsylvania Campus. Philadelphia Committee to End the War in Vietnam: The Story of the First Gas Regiment. Alibek, Ken; Handelman, Stephen. Army Chemical Center Yearbook: A Plague Upon Humanity. Introduction to the Physics of Nuclear Weapons Effects. The Chemical Warfare Service: From Laboratory to Field. Office of the Chief of Military History: B, The Chemical Warfare Service: A Study in Restraints. Burger, Marlene and Gould, Chandre. Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Terrorism. Emergency Response and Public Protection. What Can You Do! Chales, Daniel Master Mind: A Report of Accomplishments. The original manuscript was released to the public on 20 February The Earth Strikes Back. The Canadians at Ypres, We All Fall Down. The Prospect of Biological and Chemical Warfare. Biological and Chemical Weapons. The Debate Over Modern Warfare. Little, Brown and Co: Cookson, John; Nottingham, Judith. A Survey of Chemical and Biological Warfare. Chemical and Biological Warfare. Chemical and Biological Warfare an Annotated Bibliography. Cunningham, Ann M and Fitzpatrick, Mariana. Weapons of the Apocalypse. National Defense University Press: Soviet Chemical Weapons Threat. How to Think about Arms Control and Disarmament. Gassed in the Gulf. Volume 1, Number 5. Last Issue Contains rosters, photos, company and battalion photos, etc. Effects of Atomic Weapons. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory: The Story of the Special Brigade. William Blackwood and Sons: Farrar, Straus and Giroux: Part I; German Methods of Offense. A Brazilian Case Study. German Chemical Warfare Materiel. No publication date given. Circa Comprehensive review of German Chemical warfare related items including pictures and data sheets. Over pages of information. Gibrin, Le Capitaine and Simon, M. French Gilchrist, Harry L. Chemical Warfare School, Edgewood Arsenal: The Effects of Nuclear Weapons. A photographic History of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Investigation of a Deadly Outbreak. University of California Press: Harris, Robert; Paxman, Jeremy. A Higher Form of Killing. The Detection and Identification of War Gases. Hutchinson, Robert Weapons of Mass Destruction: Ishikawa, Eisei; Swain, David L transl. The Truth about Poison Gas. Experiments in Warfare Chemistry. Military Power and Potential. Gas and Flames in World War. Preparatory Manual of Chemical Warfare Agents: The Riddle of the Rhine. Death from the Skies. Poison in the Air. Congress and Nuclear Weapons. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Mangold, Tom; Goldberg, Jeff. Chemical and Biological Warfare: Where are the WMDs? War by Pestilence, Asphyxiation, and Defoliation. Medical Manual of Chemical Warfare. No Fire, No Thunder: The Threat of Chemical and Biological Weapons. Norris, John and Fowler, Will. Seeking Victory on the Western Front. University of Nebraska Press: My e-bay nemesis, cacfirstsergent, out-bid me on the last one but let me have this one cheap. Preston, Richard The Demon in the Freezer. The Chemical Weapons Taboo. Chemical and Biological Warfare the Cruellest Weapons. Technical Aspects of Chemical Warfare in the Field: Henry Hold and Company: Report of the Chemical Warfare Review Commission. The Making of the Atomic Bomb. University Press of Kansas: Avoiding Armageddon Our Future. Science Technology and the Nuclear Arms Race. Secret State Experiments on Humans. The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance. Edited by Erhard Geissler. Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia: Political, Legal, and Technical Aspects.

8: John Gofman - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

You can help by adding to it. Gofman earned his medical degree from the University of California, San Francisco , in . The researchers described low-density and high-density lipoproteins and their roles in metabolic disorders and coronary disease. This work continued throughout the late s and early s. The State of Utah had set up its own network of monitoring facilities to test milk for radioiodine, since "data pertaining to the safety of the citizens of Utah was not forthcoming from the AEC", [11] and the levels of radioactivity were found to be close to the limits prescribed by the Federal Radiation Council. The Commissioners of the AEC were "on the hot seat" and announced "a comprehensive, long-range program" to explore the effects of man-made radioactivity "upon plants, animals and human beings". He served as the first director of the LLNL biomedical research division from to and as one of the nine associate directors of the entire lab until Ramey, had not been consulted before announcing the establishment of the Biomedical Research Division. Gofman reported that "Apparently it would have been too embarrassing, with the extensive AEC publicity about the program, to cancel it outright. Instead, the budget was cut even from the low starting value and we were given to understand, in no uncertain terms, that the program was not going to be supported at the level required to do the tasks outlined originally. This was tantamount to the JCAE stating that the Livermore Bio-Medical Program was unnecessary, for without facilities to work in it was hard to envision much of a program being possible. Lewis computed that children exposed to fallout from nuclear tests may have received very high doses of radioactivity from iodine in cow milk. His estimates prompted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to request that the AEC produce a report on the risks of short-lived isotopes. Then, in , while the USSR and the USA had resumed nuclear tests and the Limited Test Ban Treaty was being prepared in response to huge international pressure, Knapp took on the task of estimating the radioiodine exposure of Americans before , at a time when milk was not monitored. He "showed that, from just one test, infants who had been living in a radiation hotspot around St. George, Utah, might well have received I doses anywhere from to times existing annual permissible doses. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. July Learn how and when to remove this template message In , Gofman raised questions about a lack of data on low-level radiation and also proposed a wide-ranging study of exposure in medicine and the workplace at a symposium for nuclear scientists and engineers. This helped start a national inquiry into the safety of atomic power. With his colleague Dr. The two scientists suggested that federal safety guidelines for low-level exposures be reduced by 90 percent in . The Atomic Energy Commission contested the findings, and "the furor made Dr. Gofman a reluctant figurehead of the anti-nuclear movement " according to The New York Times. According to an internal memo cited by Semendeferi, the BEIR I committee was to "thoroughly digest and carefully analyze various pertinent controversial models Gofman and Tamplin ". Echoing Gofman and Tamplin, the BEIR I Committee emphasized that the cancer effects of low-level radiation were of much greater concern than leukemia or genetic effects. The current radiation limit was "based on genetic considerations," and the committee concluded that the FRC limit was therefore "unnecessarily high" and could safely be much lower. July Learn how and when to remove this template message Gofman retired as a teaching professor in and became a professor emeritus of molecular and cell biology. Lovejoy was charged with malicious destruction of property for toppling a weather tower in Montague, Massachusetts , owned by Northeast Utilities. Gofman used his low-level radiation health model to predict excess cancer or leukemia deaths from the Three Mile Island accident. A retrospective study of Pennsylvania Cancer Registry found an increased incidence of thyroid cancer in counties south of TMI and in high-risk age groups. However, excess leukemia among males was observed. Yablokov and other Russian and East European researchers estimated that Chernobyl caused a million deaths through , nearly , of them in North America. The book cites "5, mainly Slavic-language

scientific papers the IAEA overlooked", notwithstanding the fact that 13 of the authors of the Chernobyl Forum were from Ukraine, Russia or Belarus. Balonov criticized the methodology of the book. Butler was a retired physicist living in the Mojave Desert town of Needles, California , and was looking for help to stop the proposed low-level nuclear waste facility at Ward Valley. With less than two weeks before the closure of the Environmental Impact Statement , the Alliance was able to mount a letter writing campaign that helped delay the EIS for an additional 90 days. Gofman also did work on the Diablo Canyon Power Plant. A small number of people will get hurt. But there will also never be a solution through unarmed freedom as long as powerful bullies exist who will use force.

9: Cancellation of Iran Nuclear Deal to Have "Strategic Consequences": US Author - Tasnim News

Bear witness to the hunt that will forever change the lives of those involved. "Hunt Down the Freeman" is the game the revolutionizes Cinematic gaming, bringing true Kino to PCs worldwide. Game.

Medical radiation is a highly important cause probably the principal cause of cancer mortality in the United States during the Twentieth Century. Medical radiation means, primarily, exposure by xrays including fluoroscopy and CT scans. Medical radiation, received even at very low and moderate doses, is an important cause of death from Ischemic Heart Disease; the probable mechanism is radiation-induction of mutations in the coronary arteries, resulting in dysfunctional clones mini-tumors of smooth muscle cells. But for 25 years the DOE has not shown any concern for the health of Americans. Their concern has been for the health of the DOE. Their falsehoods concerning the hazards of ionizing radiation have put not thousands of people at risk, not millions of people, but billions of people. Because the people of this country -- and other countries -- are not going to tolerate what it implies. Yet the DOE and others continue to talk about their "zero-risk model. Dr John Gofman We can now say, there cannot be a safe dose of radiation. There is no safe threshold. If this truth is known, then any permitted radiation is a permit to commit murder. Dr John Gofman By the way, medical radiation, from x-ray machines, is roughly twice as harmful per unit dose as Hiroshima-Nagasaki radiation. What have they taught you in radiology? Dr John Gofman If you ask me, "Do you stand against medical x-rays? We take the position: Nor did they know that the procedure could be accomplished with a third or a tenth of the dose. Joel Gray, a health physicist at the Mayo Clinic, said there are places giving you 20 times the dose needed for a given picture. You go to a physician -- your internist, or a GP, or an obstetric gynecologist, or an orthopedic surgeon -- these are the people who send you out for an x-ray. They represent, or should, your ombudsperson. What dose will I get? Dr John Gofman The medical profession is implicated directly. And he said, "John, I shudder to think of what we were doing 20 years ago. Dr John Gofman There was a time, 20 to 30 years ago, when there were mobile x-ray units that gave x-rays of the chest. They gave about five rads. Children went through those things by the thousands. But you know that a certain number of people are having cancers now as a result of what was done 15, 20 years ago. And so this resident put two and two together and said, "I gave the radiation, the child got better, therefore I cured him. One hospital in Pittsburgh said, "Why should we wait till these children come into the emergency room at night with croup? There is this wall that prevents us from relating past experience to the occurrence of cancer. The full effects are not known. And all they had to do was change the developer. But instead of that they gave the person an extra x-ray with a bigger dose. Part of the problem comes from the patient. They both have the same conflict of interest: For the DOE there have been all kinds of people of shady character in all kinds of government posts. Alla Yaroshinskaya, a journalist in Zhitomirsk, a small city in the Ukraine, became very suspicious of the sort of things that were being said. She found out that some of the people who were being moved had been moved to a place that was even hotter sometimes -- it was all just for show! But she persisted, and she got Izvestia to publish it, and she became well known. She got elected to the Supreme Soviet. And she demanded to see the protocols of government meetings on the Chernobyl situation. Women sat at tables with a little pot of radium paint, painting these dials by hand. And these women came up with the most horrible bone destruction due to the alpha particles from radium in their bone. It was all written up by , by Harrison Martland, the coroner in New Jersey who examined their bodies. The whole world knew that alpha particles from radium had done this to humans. An alpha particle is an alpha particle. In Germany and Czechoslovakia there are regions where it was long known that 50 to 75 percent of the miners died of what was called "mountain sickness. In the s, Peller and another group determined that the reason for the lung cancer in the miners was breathing radon with alpha particles from the uranium in the mines. So alpha particles had been proven to produce cancer. The AEC, which approved of some of that experimentation, knew precisely what the results would be. Merrill Eisenbund, a pro-nuclear environmentalist, was working for the AEC in He went out west to inspect what was going on in the uranium mines in Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. He was told to move over to another division, never to say anything more about the mining situation in Colorado. The

mine operators were not informed, the mine workers were not informed, and we had the lung-cancer epidemic that had been predicted. The AEC knew all this. They were the same people who approved the human experimentation. I just have lost my confidence in their integrity. A case in point. How carefully was that study set up? Who oversaw the choice of people and the outcomes? Those new cancers are going to come 10, 15 years from now. If indeed the radiation prevents [patients] from dying of the original cancer, which would have killed them in a year or two, then I say, with their fully informed knowledge, they may choose to take the radiation therapy. But I really want to be sure that the data collected on this benefit is right. So my answer to your question is: He wrote a series of papers showing that even though people got 50 rads to the thyroid, there was no excess of thyroid cancer. When I first heard about it I thought, "Wow, you can give 50 rads to the thyroid and cause no cancers? And you know what I this guy did? He threw cancers out of the study, because they occurred before five years had elapsed. Dr John Gofman "Licensing a nuclear power plant is in my view, licensing random premeditated murder. It is not a question any more: Freeman "Many people think nuclear power is so complicated it requires discussion at a high level of technicality. Because the issue is simple and straightforward. There are only two things about nuclear power that you need to know. One, why do you want nuclear power? So you can boil water. And any way of boiling water will give you steam to turn turbines. The other thing to know is, it creates a mountain of radioactivity, and I mean a mountain: And the whole thing about nuclear power is this simple: Freeman "My view is, there exists a group of people in the world that have a disease. I call it the "power disease. They are a more important plague than cancer, pneumonia, bubonic plague, tuberculosis, and heart disease put together. They can only think how to obliterate, control, and use each other. There are fifty million people a year being consumed in a nutritional holocaust around the world; nobody gives a damn about starvation. Freeman In , Dr. Ian MacKenzie, a physician in Nova Scotia, examined a patient with rapidly-growing breast cancer. He noticed that the skin on her chest showed signs of radiation burns. She explained that she had had tuberculosis and that, as part of her treatment, she had had "artificial pneumothorax therapy" one of her lungs was intentionally collapsed ; this therapy included about fluoroscopic x-rays of her lungs. Fluoroscopes deliver a much larger dose of radiation than normal x-ray snapshots. MacKenzie then studied women who had been treated for tuberculosis in one hospital between and He found that women who had not had "artificial pneumothorax therapy" had a 1-in chance of getting breast cancer; women who had had the therapy had a one-in chance of getting breast cancer. In other words, women who had had many fluoroscopic exams of their lungs had 24 times as great a chance of getting breast cancer as women who had avoided fluoroscopy. Happily, it stimulated a Japanese researcher, C. Wanebo, to examine the data gathered from the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan in In , Wanebo reported that radiation exposure at Hiroshima and Nagasaki had caused a demonstrable increase in breast cancers among surviving women.

Get Moving with Grover (Happy Healthy Monsters) The astronomer and other stories Maya X for Dummies Know your onions web design Where the wheat begins Ill tell you in person Biography of the great american benjamin franklin Tissue Engineering for Therapeutic Use 4 Hormone toxicity in the newborn Work Well (Handbooks of Pastoral Care) Sonnets of David 3 Special Committee on Prisons The Best Travel Writing 2005 Present state of Virginia The officers handbook Your career-your choice Becoming a Global Family Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine, No. 331 May, 1843 Deception point Network operating systems Pirates of the caribbean orchestra sheet music Cross sectional survey research design Science Museum Book Transform Your Bathroom In a Weekend Collectors Guide to Antique Chocolate Molds With Values Black spiritual power Bible Devotions for Bedtime Molecular biology 1st edition by david Using the MC-II handheld computer while running first or second order leveling surveys Accounting theory, continuity and change Teachers resource guide for General woodworking APPENDIX: SPINAL CORD BREATHING 535 Guide to Buying and Building A Differential diagnosis for physical therapists screening for referral 5e Brinkmann smoker cooking recipe book Pierre Nicole, Jansenist and Humanist Hildebrand, 1020-1085. Boards and beyond book usmle The Male Lumpectomy Ranches, cowboys, and characters