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The total deposition of Cs-134 and Cs-137 on the ground surface throughout all of East Japan, reflecting the results of the fourth airborne monitoring.

Legend: Total accumulation of Cs-134 and Cs-137 [Converted into the value as of November 5]

Results of the Fourth Airborne Monitoring Survey by MEXT, December 16, 2011
The triple crimes and responsibilities of the Japanese government for the Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant Accident

1. They caused the severe accident and brought serious damage to Fukushima as the result of the national policy to promote nuclear power plants.

2. They did not provide the true, accurate information regarding radioactive contamination and its risk for the people.

3. They have left people in the affected area under the condition of insufficient support and protection for the past three years.

The Japanese government has to take responsibility for these crimes!
Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant Accident

The International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) does not normally comment on events in individual countries. However, we wish to express our deepest sympathy to those in Japan affected by the recent tragic events there. Our thoughts are with them.

Throughout we have kept and continue to keep abreast of events as they unfold, particularly those at the Fukushima Nuclear Power plant, through some of our Japanese colleagues and information being provided by national and international organisations and professional societies.

We hope that the current effort to regain control of the situation will soon be successful and that our recent recommendations on radiological protection in emergency situations and for contaminated territories have and will prove helpful in dealing with the present and future circumstances.

The Commission continues to recommend optimisation and the use of reference levels to ensure an adequate degree of protection with respect to exposure to ionising radiation in emergency and existing exposure situations.
ICRP Statement on Fukushima, March 21, 2011

Based on the 2007 Recommendation (Pub.103), Pub.109, Pub.111

1. Recommend principle:
   - optimisation and the use of reference levels
     * It is actually based on “cost-benefit analysis”

2. Emergency situation:
   - reference levels for the public: 20 to 100 mSv

3. Existing exposure:
   - the radiation source is under control.
   - allow people to continue to live in the contaminated area
   - reference levels for the public: 1 to 20 mSv/ year
   - the long-term goal: 1 mSv/ year
“No clear evidence of health effect under 100mSv” is not scientifically true!

- **The lifespan study (LSS) of A-bomb survivors by the RERF**: “A formal dose-threshold analysis indicated no threshold”, “The linear dose–response relationship provided the best fit to the solid cancer data across the entire dose range in this study...” (Ozasa, 2012)

- **Retrospective cohort study of cancer risk of nuclear workers in 15 countries**: The largest study of nuclear workers ever conducted. The overall average cumulative recorded dose was 19.4 mSv. “There is a small excess risk of cancer, even at the low doses and dose rates typically received by nuclear workers in this study.” (Cardis, 2006)

- **UK nuclear workers**: Evidence for an association between mortality from non-cancer causes of death, particularly circulatory system disease, and external exposure to ionizing radiation. Mean external cumulative dose was 32.8 mSv for “external” workers and 85.0 mSv for “internal” workers. (McGeoghegan, 2008)

- **The increased incident rate of childhood cancer after in utero exposure by medical diagnostic X-ray was observed at 2.5 mSv of the fetus dose.** (Stewart, 1971)

- **The increased risk of childhood leukemia and brain tumor by medical CT was reported in the large cohort studies.** (Pearce, 2012. Mathews, 2013)
The policies of the Japanese government after the Fukushima accident, based on the ICRP Recommendations of 2007 – 1

- Standard for evacuation: 20 mSv/year
- Early standard for clean-up of schoolyards: 20 mSv/year
  They reduced the standard to 1 mSv/year later after facing strong objections from mothers.
- Goal for Clean-up of the contaminated areas:
  - The tentative goal: 20 mSv/year
  - The long-term goal: 1 mSv/year.
- The standard for returning the evacuated people:
  20 mSv/year
The policies of the Japanese government after the Fukushima accident, based on the ICRP Recommendations of 2007 – 2

- The object area of the supporting policies is limited: The government refused the request of the people “At least the area above 1 mSv/year should be supported under the special law.”

- Education of children using a textbook based on the “ICRP recommendations”: In the textbook published by the Ministry of Education, it is written that “There is no clear evidence of getting sick including cancer only because of ionizing radiation if the exposure dose is less than 100 mSv at a time.”
The policies of the Japanese government for the emergency workers at the Fukushima Diichi Nuclear Power Plants, based on the ICRP 2007 Recommendation

- The reference level of occupational exposure at an emergency exposure situation in the 2007 Recommendations:
  - life-saving (informed volunteers): No dose restrictions if benefit to others outweighs rescuer’s risk
  - other urgent rescue operations: 1000 or 500 mSv
  - other rescue operations: less than 100 mSv

- They raised the dose limit for the emergency workers: 100 mSv → 250 mSv (March 2011)
Collective Dose of the workers at the Fukushima Diichi Site

Based on the data from TEPCO: http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/betu14_j/images/140131j0403.pdf
March 22, 2011
From the Web-site of TEPCO <http://photo.tepco.co.jp/library/110322/110322_1f_kirin_2.jpg>
July 18, 2013
From the Web-site of TEPCO <http://photo.tepco.co.jp/date/2012/201207-j/120719-01j.html>
The principles of ICRP

1. Justification:
   “Any decision that alters the radiation exposure situation should do more good than harm.”

   * Only the protective measures which produce “net benefit” can be “justified”.

2. Optimization of protection:
   “the likelihood of incurring exposures, the number of people exposed, and the magnitude of their individual doses should all be kept as low as reasonably achievable, taking into account economic and societal factors.” (ALARA)

   * Balance cost and benefit and manage to get the biggest benefit.

3. Application of dose limits:
   “Total dose to individual should not exceed the appropriate limits.”

   * The politically decided standard of dose for individual.
ICRP recommends measurement and dose limits based on

“Cost-benefit analysis” not science

An example of optimization of radiation protection by the design of a simple shield

\[ e^{-r_{w_0}} = \frac{X_V}{\tau \alpha H_{\mu f} \beta} \frac{hl}{N} \]

\[ = \frac{10^2 \text{ $m}^{-3}}{15 \text{ m}^2 \text{ man}^{-1}} \frac{10^4 \text{ $(\text{man Sv})^{-1}}}{14 \text{ m}^{-1} 5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ Sv y}^{-1} 0.1 20 \text{ y}} \]

Thus,

\[ e^{-r_{w_0}} = 0.1 \]

They evaluated “the life of a person” by counting dollars with the factor of $10^4 \text{ $ / man \cdot Sv.}$

ICRP recommends measurement and dose limits based on
“Cost-benefit analysis” not science
Another example of calculation: value of relocation in the case of nuclear accident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of country</th>
<th>$c$ (US$ per man-month)</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (US$ per man Sv)</th>
<th>$c/\alpha$ (mSv per month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich developed</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>15 (rounded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They consider that the value of people is more than 10 times cheaper in “developing” countries than in “rich developed” countries. Thus they recommend the higher radiation standard for protective measure for developing countries.

The tricks and problems of underestimating radiation risk, in the ICRP 1977 Recommendations - 1

1. Introduction of the model of “Effective dose equivalent” which converts the internal organ dose to the whole body dose.

2. Using the underestimated risk assessment on cancer and leukemia of A-bomb survivors to calculate the radiation risk.

3. Relative evaluation of the radiation risk in comparison to the different quality of risks such as traffic accidents and workers accidents in other industries.

4. Considering only the radiation risk of a standard adult man without considering those who are more sensitive to radiation such as children and fetuses.

5. Considering only the risks of the death from cancer and leukemia and serious genetic disorders, and ignoring the risk of non-cancer diseases and the genetic effect on and beyond the 3rd generation.
Life span study (LSS) of A-bomb survivors

- The data of A-bomb survivors clearly show Linear-non threshold theory (LNT) is best fit to the radiation risk assessment of solid cancer.

* The low dose under 100 mSv can add certain risk of cancer in proportion to the exposure dose.

- Dose and dose rate factor (DDREF) is close to 1.

* that chronic and low-dose-rate exposure can make the equal amount of risk of cancer to acute exposure.

“The expected DDREF based on the ratio of ERR per dose in those studies to that in the LSS appeared to be close to 1.0, nominally lower than the factors suggested by BEIR VII (1.5) and ICRP (2.0).” (Ozasa, 2012)
The critical review on the WHO report on Fukushima -1

1. The health risk assessment is limited only on leukemia, female breast cancer and thyroid cancer.

2. They estimated increased life time risks of all solid cancer (4%), leukemia (7%), breast cancer (6%), thyroid cancer (70%) over baseline rates in the highest dose location. For the people in the second most affected location, risk is estimated to be about one-half.

3. They consider “70% increased risk” is not very much.
4. They ignore the risk in the rest of the Fukushima prefecture population and that of neighboring prefectures.

5. They support the Japanese government’s underestimation of radiation risk and endorse the inadequate health management policies in the affected area.

6. They suggest that psychological factor is more important than the risk of radiation.

7. They tried to minimize the possibility of underestimation.
The critical review on the UNSCEAR report on Fukushima -1

1. Underestimating the health risk of low-dose of radiation
   * Not based on the Linear Non-threshold-theory (LNT)
   * “No discernible”, “indistinguishable from other cancers”
   * Not using the “collective dose” to estimate the health risk

2. Problem of the dose estimate

3. They consider health risk of workers is “indiscernible”
The critical review on the UNSCEAR report on Fukushima -2

4. Emphasizing “health effect is on mental and social well-being”

5. They give endorsement to the inadequate health management and support to the affected people from the Japanese government.

6. They ignore the health risk on non-cancer disease.
WHO and UNSCEAR

- Both the WHO and UNSCEAR say that the estimated health risk is within the “normal spatial fluctuation”, “not discernible” or “indistinguishable from other cancers”

- We have to note, “not statistically significant at certain point” is not equal to “no health effect” from radiation exposure.

- For us, from the point of view to protect people, it is important to estimate the health risk of both residents in the contaminated area and nuclear workers based on the LNT without using DDREF and by using the collective dose of the population.

- Note that UNSCEAR even criticize WHO because WHO estimated the risk based on the LNT without using DDREF and by using the collective dose.
The Japanese government quotes WHO and UNSCEA as the “international authorities” for the communication of radiation risk to the public.
IAEA and other international bodies have been underestimating the radiation health impacts of Chernobyl.

IAEA-Chernobyl Forum, Sep. 2005

They reported that only childhood thyroid cancer and leukemia of clean-up workers are significant radiation health effects found after the Chernobyl accident.

The doctors and scientists of the three affected countries and all over the world made argument against the statement from IAEA.