

## Emails About “Afraid of Radiation?” with My Responses

I found your article to be very interesting and convincing. So, I will give to you a piece of anecdotal evidence.

A friend of mine who was an X-ray lab technician for several years during the mid-sixties to early seventies, gave birth to a baby who had a rare birth defect (I don't know the name of it but the baby need much medical care for it's first year or two). And, her friend who was also an X-ray tech and worked with her in the same hospital also had a baby with the exact same defect.

Maybe radiation is like alcohol which can be a healthy substance but should be avoided by pregnant women.

### *My Response:*

The dose makes the poison. Drinking too much water or too high a concentration of oxygen for too long will kill you. Low dose radiation, it would appear, lowers the incidence of birth defects. Too much increases it. Your alcohol analogy is a good one.

---

Do you have any data on the radiation health dangers from depleted uranium weapons (we've deposited in Iraq)?

### *My Response:*

The maximum radiation dose received by a crewmember inside a tank from being around DU armor and DU ammunition is 2.4 mrem/hour = 876 mrem per year. This dose is less than that received by those apartment dwellers in Taiwan who had a 97 percent reduction in the incidence of cancer living in their cobalt-60 contaminated buildings.

Any health hazards attributed to DU weapons are based on the linear no-threshold hypothesis, which belongs in the trash heap of disproved models alongside the hypotheses that says the earth is flat.

---

Thanks for a very funny article. Your sense of humor is exquisite.

---

A friend just sent me your article on radiation effects. Fabulous read – most amusing, entertaining and informative. Must go and do my Potassium-40 shopping at our local supermarket – TESCO. I'm sure there's some in milk.

---

I read with interest your "Afraid of Radiation? Low Doses are Good for You" article on LewRockwell.com. 20 years ago I was diagnosed with Hodgkin's Disease and was radiated 5 days a week for 3 and a half months. I have had 3 basil cell cancers removed in the intervening years. My body has a large number of small flat moles in the area of radiation, as compared to the non-radiated areas.

From what you know about radiation, have I received enough to be in the hormesis sweet spot? Or have I receive too much?

Your article was thought provoking and certainly not what I believed.

---

I think this is a very informative article, but it leaves out two very important points: The idiots who actually force regulations on the rest of the world to make everything as expensive as possible with this nonsense that any bit of radiation no matter how small is very harmful and regulations must be enforced to make sure that people are not subject to these traces of radiation when they have time fly off to Vail / Aspen to go skiing. Now along the top of the Continental Divide natural radiation levels are very high and according to the nonsense put out by those scared to death of radiation very harmful, but it seems that the same level of radiation in a working nuclear plant is very harmful and all nuclear plants must be made so expensive the world will run out of energy.....while on the other hand no amount of radiation encountered while having recreation....like skiing is even faintly harmful. More amazing of course is that the natural level of radiation in an airliner at 40,000 feet is another order of magnitude higher than even places like Aspen and yet those who are so utterly frightened of radiation that they want to do away with Nuclear Energy are never bothered by the very high levels they encounter on airplanes while flying from meeting to meeting to explain how dangerous the most minute trace of radiation is.

---

I have followed your articles and look forward to them. This is extremely important news, and especially the peer-reviewed journal article contained therein. Thanks for having the cojones to write heresy--the more heresy the better!

---

I just read your article "Afraid of Radiation...?" - thank you! I am very familiar with the content and those supporters of the science. Last week I attended a conference (in Waikiki) sponsored by the American Nuclear Society - the Pacific Basin Nuclear Conference - where much of the latest research about cellular adaptive responses, bystander effects etc., was presented.

My husband and I own and operate the Free Enterprise Radon Health Mine in Boulder. A radon inhalation facility established in 1952 after a short time of uranium mining. Response to this 'alternative' therapy is real and effective (immune system). Our goal is to host research in any manner - our guests are willing to participate. Finding willing medical participation is not easy.

Should you ever be in our area, please drop by to speak with our guests; to tour our facility. Perhaps you have a patient or two that might benefit - with the hopes of studying the results via real medical means.

Even though I grew up in Montana, I lived in Seattle since 1972 and returned to Montana in 1994 to take over the "family business". We've never regreted the move. We do miss the wonderful biking (Seattle to Portland etc.), walking trails, the great restaurants (I founded Lake Route Cafe in early 1980's - Rainier Beach), the arts - but I'm happy to put all that aside to be here for our guests - those who have found no other options for their health issues.

Your support is most appreciated - more than you know!

---

*From Dan Belforti, 2004 Libertarian Candidate for U.S. Congress:*

Great article Dr. Miller! The problem I have with nuclear power plants is not the radioactivity, but the expense to taxpayers. As I put it on my campaign web site:

The main problem with nuclear power is that it is one of the biggest recipients of government subsidies. I oppose all direct and indirect government participation in the nuclear energy industry, including subsidies, research and development funds, guaranteed loans, waste disposal subsidies, and federal uranium enrichment facilities. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should be abolished; full liability -- not government agencies -- should regulate nuclear power. The Price-Anderson Act, through which the government limits liability for nuclear accidents and furnishes partial payment at taxpayer expense, should be repealed. Nuclear energy should be denationalized and the industry's assets transferred to the private sector. I believe in a free market, and energy is no exception. Insurance companies would have to be paid by the producer to ensure against accidents (which they don't since taxpayers bear that cost now).

If I'm mistaken, please explain so that I may be enlightened and will change my position. Thanks.

---

*From a former ship yard worker:*

I do not know where you get your information but it is seriously flawed. As I can attest to (being a shipyard worker and nuclear qualified) the legal limit for radiation exposure with out being tracked is 1mr/hr! That is 2080mr/year. Now that yearly figure runs above other legal limits but is a black hole because it is assumed no one will be next to a barrier for a entire working year. That assumption on the surface is flawed, as is your defense of nuclear reactors in general. You are either with the program or your not....and if you are not.....you soon are let go. That includes the safety department which is charged along with radcon (Code 105) to provide for the safety of nuclear workers.

Then you totally fail to account that the ones not working on submarines (ie. non nuc workers) are being....or were being exposed to asbestos.....pcbs.....lead.....mercury and God knows what else that led to many cancers and deaths thus making the nuc. workers look better when compared to their non nuc. brethren. And by the way I understand that subs use lead for gamma

shielding but that's highly purified reactor plant lead.....not ballest lead which also contains a host of other harmful elements .....a common one which is the metal Arsenic. And yes, I have personally seen workers with airborne levels of both lead and arsenic far above legal limits being monitored.and the exposure when written down being below federal limits. Wanna bet that does not happen in the nuc. world as well? What you do not seem to realize.....it is a political situation. Many many high level plush jobs depend on reactors. The navy even jokes that submarines are designed to carry the damn reactor around the ocean. And sad to say ....at least as concerns the 688 class running the S6W reactor.....that seems to be true as they are not as good as far older boats.

I am not afraid of reactors.....but I am very afraid of the idiots running them. I could tell you horror stories all night. A chain is only as good as its weakest link.....and in the case of reactors...it is the people running them and making the decisions which are the weakest links. Why we have not had much worst fiasco's than "Three Mile Island" I will never know. I suspect the real reason is the incidents are covered up by our secrecy laws. Twice in my career I have threatened the head of the local Radcon Office to go to NRRO and blow the whistle on what were very unsafe conditions. In both cases I was told if I did.....I would no longer be working there. In both cases the threats paid off ....and the conditions I complained about, were corrected. Up to that point.....nobody cared.....even though people were being exposed far above the legal limits established by our country (which by the way.....are 100 times higher than Soviet Union legal limits.....or so I have read). You seem to be approaching this issue from a very theoretical angle utilizing published manuscripts. I am telling you it is a highly political one....and while I will not say they are lying.....I will say I am damn glad to be retired.....and I want to be as far away from any damn reactor as possible.....either land based or on a ship. I lived the life....and walked the walk I did not just read about it. And if I have to go back to using beeswax candles for light.....I will still believe it is for the better.

Notice I did not even bring up the largest problem of all....which is what do you do with the waste products? That problem alone would or should eliminate every damn reactor in the world. But then again.....lots of individuals might lose a lot of money!

Why don't you write a piece about the recent accident(?) at Bangor.....where your disaster team was not even notified and the Canadians are now complaining about. Come to find out....the Navy would have violated the law if they did notify anybody. I suggest you ponder that statement (after verifying it) and then see if you feel the same about nuclear power.....whether it be Trident missiles or land based power plants.

### *My Response:*

The accident at Bangor, from what I can learn about it, involved no release of radiation.

The fear instilled by thinking about radiation in millirems is unjustified. Radiation in mrem doses prevents cancer and birth defects. The (U.S.) government's maximum permissible annual dose of 5,000 mrem is arguably 5 to 10 times lower than it should be. When the limit was 36 rem, no deaths or injuries were reported.

Next week I will have a second article on this subject on LewRockwell.com, titled "Advantages of Nuclear Power." Compared to coal and hydropower for producing electricity, nuclear energy is by far the cleanest and safest. As I discuss in that article, with 442 nuclear power plants operating in 32 countries for a cumulative 10,000 reactor-years of commercial operation, the 28 deaths that occurred at Chernobyl are the only radiation-related fatalities to have occurred.

The best way to operate nuclear reactors safely is to privatize them and get the government, and government-salaried workers out of them. Fed Ex keeps their Cargo planes in good repair and running 16 hours a day, for example, much better than the Air Force does theirs, which are in a much worse state of repair and are only able to run an average of 2 hours a day.

Nuclear waste, especially when one does not think about them in small millirem doses, is not a problem. Wastes from burning coal, however, ARE a problem.