

Textutdrag från diskussionen mellan Jack Valentin och Christopher Busby

Vid presentationen vid Mark- och miljödomstolen den 8 september 2017 gjorde Christopher Busby två påståenden angående uttalanden kring strålningsrisker av Jack Valentin, f.d. vetenskaplig sekreterare för ICRP. Uttalandena gjordes under en diskussion mellan Valentin och Busby vid ett möte arrangerat av MILKAS den 22 april 2009, och en film från mötet lades sedan upp på nätet [1,2]. Busby har vid åtskilliga tillfällen hänvisat till vad Valentin sade under mötet men har endast återgivit en del av diskussionen, vilket ger en missvisande bild. Därför skrev jag år 2012 ned hela diskussionen från mötet och lade upp den för allmän tillgänglighet på en hemsida som drivs av nätverket Nuclear Power Yes Please [3]. Nedan finns tre utdrag från textversionen med de avsnitt som relaterar till Busbys två påståenden vid Mark- och miljödomstolen. Understreckade partier är de jag tolkar som relevanta i relation till vad Busby påstår. Vid eventuella felaktigheter i textversionen hänvisas till vad som sägs i filmen.

Mattias Lantz

[1] Film från mötet, del 1 <https://vimeo.com/15382750>

[2] Film från mötet, del 2 <https://vimeo.com/15398081>

[3] Textversion <http://nuclearpoweryesplease.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=16&t=2310>.

Påstående 1 av Busby: "he [Jack Valentin] stated that the ICRP risk model could not be used to predict the health effects of radiation exposures in human populations because the errors for certain internal exposures could be as high as 900-fold,"

Två utdrag från textversionen [3]:

- **Christophe Busby (CB):** Can the ICRP model be used by governments to predict the consequences of a nuclear accident in terms of cancer yield?

Jack Valentin (JV): I think basically no, because the uncertainties are too large. Now I think the uncertainties we are talking about would be in the order of an order magnitude, I think you talk about two orders of magnitude, and therefore we have a difference. But I think the order of magnitude that I'm talking about is enough to say that it's not useful for that sort of prognosis.

CB: Well what's the point of it then?

JV: You get an upper limit of course. You think that your worst likely number of cases would be X, that ten times X can be excluded.

[...]

- **CB:** What do you call a large uncertainty?

JV: What do I call a large uncertainty? Well, certainly two orders of magnitude is a very large uncertainty.

CB: So it could be an error by two orders of magnitude for certain internal exposures. Then we agree?

JV: I would hate for you to go out and say: Jack agreed with me.

CB: Well, I need to have an answer.

JV: Then the answer is: I don't agree with you.

CB: But you just said two orders of magnitude?

JV: Yes, but I am sure you can find an exceptional case, a specific case where there would actually be that sort of and uncertainty. Remember it can also go in the other direction. And I'm sure that you can find in most cases uncertainties with are less than one order of magnitude which I would find normally. If we look at the existing evidence I don't think you've got enough evidence to prove your case.

CB: The existing evidence is 3 orders of magnitude. If we take the child leukemia clusters

around nuclear sites, we're talking about 3 orders of magnitude.

JV: Well that's what you are claiming on the basis of a handful of cases.

Påstående 2 av Busby: "and that the official risk agencies had been wrong in not looking at Chernobyl effects, but as Secretary he did what he was told."

Ett utdrag från textversionen [3].

- **CB:** [...] The European Union have said in many documents that, and WHO too although they probably do not believe it although they say it, that one should look at all sources of information, and as scientists you should look at all sources of information, you can give them different weightings. But the fact is that you have never cited any one of the articles which falsify or argue that your levels of risk are out by an enormous amount. Why?

JV: This puts me in a slightly difficult position, of course, because I tend to agree with you that we should have quoted some of your stuff, and of course since we do not believe in a lot of the things that you're saying we should have said why we don't believe in that, but I tend to agree that ICRP should have done a better job in reacting as it were to some of your stuff. And of course, I'm not a civil servant. If you got the scientific secretary of ICRP, you press a button on its back then and it says what it's supposed to say. Now I am retired and can say, yes I think so.

But by and large I don't think that there are too many people who are greatly impressed by the evidence you're giving. I think it would have been much wiser in that situation to state more clearly why we are not impressed as it were, and thus also giving you a chance to come back again and say this is why I think you are wrong and so forth. Because that is of course the way forward to make sure that we, well if we do not agree with each other, but at least I agree with you that we should at least understand why we do not agree with each other.

CB: For example this book here was published in 2006, and prior to that the CERRIE Minority Report was published in 2004. And both of those documents, and this one certainly, has hundreds of references from the Russian language literature which show extraordinarily enormous effects from radioactivity on genetic damage in plants, so it can't be radio-phobia, in fish, which can't be radio-phobia either, an enormous document here with evidence which has been entirely ignored, and it's not mentioned in any of the UN or the ICRP or the BEIR documents which you must surely concede people would think are driven by biased scientists who want to sustain the idea that radiation is what you say.

JV: I have already agreed that it would have made more sense for us to quote more of your stuff. With us I do mean the mainstream community, not just the ICRP, not UNSCEAR, BEIR and such like. I don't know what more I can say. We're not talking here about individual results, because for most of them I believe some of my colleagues will come up with various technical comments. But the philosophical idea that we ought to comment more about your work I tend to agree.