

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: FW: Comments on Nuclear Waste Confidence - Michael J. Keegan
Attachments: Comments on Nuclear Waste Confidence December 20, 2013.docx

**DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SECY-067**

PR#: PR-51

FRN#: 78FR56775

NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2012-0246

SECY DOCKET DATE: 12/20/13

TITLE: Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

COMMENT#: 00702

From: mkeeganj@comcast.net [mailto:mkeeganj@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2013 10:35 PM
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Cc: mkeeganj
Subject: Comments on Nuclear Waste Confidence - Michael J. Keegan

Dear Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov

Waste Confidence Hearings - Written Comment Docket ID No. NRC–2012–0246

Comments of Michael J. Keegan, Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes

Albert Einstein has defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. This December 2013 marks 71 years since the first generation of high level nuclear waste and the world still does not know what to do with the very first cupful.

The reliance on the “Human Exceptionalist Paradigm” which suggests that although we don’t know what to do with it now, we’ll figure it out later because we are so exceptional is snake oil. Societal costs have been exorbitant, loss of liberty, loss of health, loss of finances.

This is a Confidence Game and it has always been such. After 71 years what is known is that there is no good solution. We are left with the lesser of evils. All solutions are temporary and there is no disposal. Simply you can’t get rid of it.

Full cost accounting is absolutely necessary. There has been no cost benefit analysis provided. Alternatives to the generation of more nuclear waste through re-licensing and issuance of new licenses for new build must be considered. According to National Environmental Policy Act project proponents must first take a “Hard Look” at alternatives. Regulators and Industry simply will not answer the question who will pay for

repackaging of Dry Casks in perpetuity? Perpetual repackaging. What will be the cost of security for hundreds of years to come?

The Jig is up. There may have been a day, several decades ago when it was thought that there would one day be a solution. What is now known is that there is no solution, just bad options with costs which will be borne by thousands of generations to come. This entire process is the next level of the Confidence Game.

To continue to generate high level nuclear waste among the most toxic and lethal poisons known to mankind are crimes against humanity and crimes against the future.

I am compelled to enter into the record and public comment the Principles of International Law Recognized in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal and in the Judgment of the Tribunal.

Principle I

Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefor and liable to punishment.

Principle II

The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.

Principle III

The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible Government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.

Principle IV

The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

Principle V

Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.

Principle VI

The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under; international law:

a. **Crimes against peace:**

- i. Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;

ii. Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).

b. **War crimes:**

Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave-labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war, of persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

c. **Crimes against humanity:**

Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.

Principle VII

Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principles VI is a crime under international law.

Please enter into the record this testimony by Dr. John Gofman which further articulates how the generation of nuclear power and waste constitute violations of the Nuremberg Principles.

Dr. John Gofman (Ph.D. in nuclear-physical chemistry and M.D.)

Nuclear Power: A Simple Question

Many people think nuclear power is so complicated it requires discussion at a high level of technicality. That's pure nonsense. 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. That's all it does. It boils water. And any way of boiling water will give you steam to turn turbines. That's the useful part.

The other thing to know is, it creates a mountain of radioactivity, and I mean a *mountain*: astronomical quantities of strontium-90 and cesium-137 and plutonium—toxic substances that will last—strontium-90 and cesium for 300 to 600 years, plutonium for 250,000 to 500,000 years—and still be deadly toxic. And the whole thing about nuclear power is this simple: can you or can't you keep it all contained? If you can't, then you're creating a human disaster.

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 see, those workers are allowed to procreate, and if you damage their genes by radiation, and they intermarry with the rest of the population, for genetic purposes it's just the same as if you irradiate the population directly.^[27]

So I find nuclear power this simple: do you believe they're going to do the miracle of containment that they predict? The answer is they're not going to accomplish it. It's outside the realm of human prospects.

You don't need to discuss each valve and each transportation cask and each burial site. The point is, if you lose a little bit of it—a terribly little bit of it—you're going to contaminate the earth, and people are going to suffer for thousands of generations. You have two choices: either you believe that engineers are going to achieve a

perfection that's never been achieved, and you go ahead; or you believe with common sense that such a containment is never going to be achieved, and you give it up.

If people really understood how simple a problem it is—that they've got to accomplish a miracle—no puffs like Three Mile Island—can't afford those puffs of radioactivity, or the squirts and the spills that they always tell you won't harm the public—if people understood that, they'd say, "This is ridiculous. You don't create this astronomical quantity of garbage and pray that somehow a miracle will happen to contain it. You just don't do such stupid things!"

Licensing a nuclear power plant is in my view, licensing random premeditated murder. First of all, when you license a plant, you know what you're doing—so it's premeditated. You can't say, "I didn't know." Second, the evidence on radiation-producing cancer is beyond doubt. I've worked fifteen years on it, and so have many others. It is not a question any more: radiation produces cancer, and the evidence is good all the way down to the lowest doses.

The only way you could license nuclear power plants and not have murder is if you could guarantee perfect containment. But they admit that they're not going to contain it perfectly. They allow workers to get irradiated, and they have an allowable dose for the population.^[28] So in essence I can figure out from their allowable amounts how many they are willing to kill per year.

I view this as a disgrace, as a public health disgrace. The idea of anyone saying that it's all right to murder so many in exchange for profits from electricity—or what they call "benefits" from electricity—the idea that it's all right to do that is a new advance in depravity, particularly since it will affect future generations.

You must decide what your views are on this: is it all right to murder people knowingly? If so, why do you worry about homicide? But if you say, "The number won't be too large. We might only kill fifty thousand—and that's like automobiles"—is that all right? . . .

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. Scientists like myself who said in 1957, "Maybe Linus Pauling is right about radiation causing cancer, but we don't really know, and therefore we shouldn't stop progress," were saying in essence that it's all right to experiment. Since we don't know, let's go ahead. So we were experimenting on humans, weren't we? 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 experimentation—you are committing a higher crime. Scientists who support these nuclear plants—*knowing* the effects of radiation—don't deserve trials for experimentation; they deserve trials for murder. . . .

. . . The only solution is, you must stop *all* efforts to develop first-strike force solutions everywhere—whether they be nuclear or other—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.S. and the USSR, they'd go on to research mind control or some chemical or biological thing. My view is, there exists a group of people in the world that have a disease. I call it the "power disease." They want to rule and control other people. 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. They use people as nothing more than instruments to cast aside when they don't need them any more. There are fifty million people a year being consumed in a nutritional holocaust around the world; nobody gives a damn about starvation. If fifty million white Westerners were dying, affluent Western society would worry, but as long as it's fifty million Third World people dying every year, it doesn't matter.

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. The structure we have now is, the sicker you are socially, the more likely it is that you'll come out at the top of the heap.

Dr. Gofman (September 21, 1918 – August 15, 2007) was a Professor Emeritus at the University of California, Berkeley (Ph.D. in nuclear-physical chemistry and an M.D.) who was the first Director of the Biomedical Research Division of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory from 1963-65 and one of nine Associate Directors at the Lab from 1963-1969. He was involved in the Manhattan Project and was a co-discoverer of Uranium-232, Plutonium-232, Uranium-233, and Plutonium-233, and of slow and fast neutron fissionability of Uranium-233. He also was a co-inventor of the uranyl acetate and columbium oxide processes for plutonium separation. He taught in the radioisotope and radiobiology fields from the 1950s at least up into the 1980s, and did research in radiochemistry, macromolecules, lipoproteins, coronary heart disease, arteriosclerosis, trace element determination, x-ray spectroscopy, chromosomes and cancer and radiation hazards. Starting in 1969 he began to challenge the AEC claim that there was a "safe threshold" of radiation below which no adverse health effects could be detected.

<http://www.ratical.org/radiation/inetSeries/nwJWG.html#line41>

Albert Einstein also informs us “To the village square we must carry the facts of atomic energy. From there must come America’s voice.” The people have spoken. Stop making it!

Cease and desist. Stop making it period. Do not relicense, do not license new ones. You don't know what to do with what you have.

Thank you

Michael J. Keegan
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes
P.O. Box 463
Monroe, MI 48161

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 728

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C4A11E)

Subject: FW: Comments on Nuclear Waste Confidence - Michael J. Keegan
Sent Date: 12/26/2013 11:14:29 AM
Received Date: 12/26/2013 11:14:30 AM
From: RulemakingComments Resource

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time	
MESSAGE	13919	12/26/2013 11:14:30 AM	
Comments on Nuclear Waste Confidence December 20, 2013.docx			21210

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

Dear Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov

Waste Confidence Hearings - Written Comment Docket ID No. NRC-2012-0246

Comments of Michael J. Keegan, Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes

Albert Einstein has defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. This December 2013 marks 71 years since the first generation of high level nuclear waste and the world still does not know what to do with the very first cupful.

The reliance on the “Human Exceptionalist Paradigm” which suggests that although we don’t know what to do with it now, we’ll figure it out later because we are so exceptional is snake oil. Societal costs have been exorbitant, loss of liberty, loss of health, loss of finances.

This is a Confidence Game and it has always been such. After 71 years what is known is that there is no good solution. We are left with the lesser of evils. All solutions are temporary and there is no disposal. Simply you can’t get rid of it.

Full cost accounting is absolutely necessary. There has been no cost benefit analysis provided. Alternatives to the generation of more nuclear waste through re-licensing and issuance of new licenses for new build must be considered. According to National Environmental Policy Act project proponents must first take a “Hard Look” at alternatives. Regulators and Industry simply will not answer the question who will pay for repackaging of Dry Casks in perpetuity? Perpetual repackaging. What will be the cost of security for hundreds of years to come?

The Jig is up. There may have been a day, several decades ago when it was thought that there would one day be a solution. What is now known is that there is no solution, just bad options with costs which will be borne by thousands of generations to come. This entire process is the next level of the Confidence Game.

To continue to generate high level nuclear waste among the most toxic and lethal poisons known to mankind are crimes against humanity and crimes against the future.

I am compelled to enter into the record and public comment the Principles of International Law Recognized in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal and in the Judgment of the Tribunal.

Principle I

Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefor and liable to punishment.

Principle II

The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.

Principle III

The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible Government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.

Principle IV

The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

Principle V

Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.

Principle VI

The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under; international law:

- a. **Crimes against peace:**
 - i. Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;
 - ii. Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).
- b. **War crimes:**

Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave-labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war, of persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

c. **Crimes against humanity:**

Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.

Principle VII

Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principles VI is a crime under international law.

Please enter into the record this testimony by Dr. John Gofman which further articulates how the generation of nuclear power and waste constitute violations of the Nuremberg Principles.

Dr. John Gofman (Ph.D. in nuclear-physical chemistry and M.D.)

Nuclear Power: A Simple Question

Many people think nuclear power is so complicated it requires discussion at a high level of technicality. That's pure nonsense. 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. That's all it does. It boils water. And any way of boiling water will give you steam to turn turbines. That's the useful part.

The other thing to know is, it creates a mountain of radioactivity, and I mean a *mountain*: astronomical quantities of strontium-90 and cesium-137 and plutonium—toxic substances that will last—strontium-90 and cesium for 300 to 600 years, plutonium for 250,000 to 500,000 years—and still be deadly toxic. And the whole thing about nuclear power is this simple: can you or can't you keep it all contained? If you can't, then you're creating a human disaster.

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 see, those workers are allowed to procreate, and if you damage their genes by radiation, and they intermarry with the rest of the population, for genetic purposes it's just the same as if you irradiate the population directly.[27]

So I find nuclear power this simple: do you believe they're going to do the miracle of containment that they predict? The answer is they're not going to accomplish it. It's outside the realm of human prospects.

You don't need to discuss each valve and each transportation cask and each burial site. The point is, if you lose a little bit of it—a terribly little bit of it—you're going to contaminate the earth, and people are going to suffer for thousands of generations. You have two choices: either you believe that engineers are going to achieve a perfection that's never been achieved, and you go ahead; or you believe with common sense that such a containment is never going to be achieved, and you give it up.

If people really understood how simple a problem it is—that they've got to accomplish a miracle—no puffs like Three Mile Island—can't afford those puffs of radioactivity, or the squirts and the spills that they always tell you won't harm the public—if people understood that, they'd say, "This is ridiculous. You don't create this astronomical quantity of garbage and pray that somehow a miracle will happen to contain it. You just don't do such stupid things!"

Licensing a nuclear power plant is in my view, licensing random premeditated murder. First of all, when you license a plant, you know what you're doing—so it's premeditated. You can't say, "I didn't know." Second, the evidence on radiation-producing cancer is beyond doubt. I've worked fifteen years on it, and so have many others. It is not a question any more: radiation produces cancer, and the evidence is good all the way down to the lowest doses.

The only way you could license nuclear power plants and not have murder is if you could guarantee perfect containment. But they admit that they're not going to contain it perfectly. They allow workers to get irradiated, and they have an allowable dose for the population.^[28] So in essence I can figure out from their allowable amounts how many they are willing to kill per year.

I view this as a disgrace, as a public health disgrace. The idea of anyone saying that it's all right to murder so many in exchange for profits from electricity—or what they call "benefits" from electricity—the idea that it's all right to do that is a new advance in depravity, particularly since it will affect future generations.

You must decide what your views are on this: is it all right to murder people knowingly? If so, why do you worry about homicide? But if you say, "The number won't be too large. We might only kill fifty thousand—and that's like automobiles"—is that all right? . . .

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. Scientists like myself who said in 1957, "Maybe Linus Pauling is right about radiation causing cancer, but we don't really know, and therefore we shouldn't stop progress," were saying in essence that it's all right to experiment. Since we don't know, let's go ahead. So we were experimenting on humans, weren't we? 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 experimentation—you are committing a higher crime. Scientists who support these nuclear plants—*knowing* the effects of radiation—don't deserve trials for experimentation; they deserve trials for murder. . . .

. . . The only solution is, you must stop *all* efforts to develop first-strike force solutions everywhere—whether they be nuclear or other—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.S. and the USSR, they'd go on to research mind control or some chemical or biological thing. My view is, there exists a group of people in the world that have a disease. I call it the "power disease." They want to rule and control other people. 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. They use people as nothing more than instruments to cast aside when they don't need them any more. There are fifty million people a year being consumed in a nutritional holocaust around the world; nobody gives a damn about starvation. If fifty million white Westerners were dying, affluent Western society would worry, but as long as it's fifty million Third World people dying every year, it doesn't matter.

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. The structure we have now is, the sicker you are socially, the more likely it is that you'll come out at the top of the heap.

Dr. Gofman (September 21, 1918 – August 15, 2007) was a Professor Emeritus at the University of California, Berkeley (Ph.D. in nuclear-physical chemistry and an M.D.) who was the first Director of the Biomedical Research Division of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory from 1963-65 and one of nine Associate Directors at the Lab from 1963-1969. He was involved in the Manhattan Project and was a co-discoverer of Uranium-232, Plutonium-232, Uranium-233, and Plutonium-233, and of slow and fast neutron fissionability of Uranium-233. He also was a co-inventor of the uranyl acetate and columbium oxide processes for plutonium separation. He taught in the radioisotope and radiobiology fields from the 1950s at least up into the 1980s, and did research in radiochemistry, macromolecules, lipoproteins, coronary heart disease, arteriosclerosis, trace element determination, x-ray spectroscopy, chromosomes and cancer and radiation hazards. Starting in 1969 he began to challenge the AEC claim that there was a "safe threshold" of radiation below which no adverse health effects could be detected.

<http://www.ratical.org/radiation/inetSeries/nwJWG.html#line41>

Albert Einstein also informs us “To the village square we must carry the facts of atomic energy. From there must come America’s voice.” The people have spoken. Stop making it!

Cease and desist. Stop making it period. Do not relicense, do not license new ones. You don't know what to do with what you have.

Michael J. Keegan
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes
P.O. Box 463
Monroe, MI 48161