

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR CARLOS S. CAMACHO REGARDING JAPANESE PROPOSAL
TO DUMP NUCLEAR WASTES IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

DELIVERED AT THE MICRONESIAN CHIEF EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATION
AUGUST 14-15, 1980

The members of the Japanese delegation have expressed their nation's dire need for additional sources of energy and cite this as rational for its expanding nuclear industry. This we understand, for want of energy source is a calamity that we share with Japan. But one calamity is enough for us, and we do not want to add to it the calamity of living in a damaged ocean.

I came to this meeting expecting to hear many expressions of good will, many reassurances of the safety of the proposed methods, something about the meticulous way in which materials would be monitored, something about the cost-benefits in which human lives are brought into the same equation with the statistical probability of accident, and a great confusion of scientific facts and data. I have not been disappointed in these expectations. Neither am I surprised that my basic convictions have been changed not at all. I came to this meeting opposed to this method of disposing of radio-active wastes, and I leave this meeting still opposed to it; actually, perhaps, a little more opposed, for I sense a kind of deviousness that I cannot distinguish from brain-washing.

I have been raised and I have been professionally trained to have respect, even reverence, for the scientific process and for the considered opinion of highly trained scientists. But the spectacle of nuclear scientists (at this meeting and elsewhere) differing wildly in their assessment of hazards, shakes my faith severely, and makes me realize that they are just as subject to biases as any other human beings. Seriously, I wonder if this relatively new specialty, especially in its health implications, is any fur-

ther advanced than was the science of astronomy at the time of Copernicus. Certainly the record of miscalculations in this field for the last thirty years is monumental and shocking; and I say to all of you that before I am willing to commit the lives and well-being of our citizens and of our descendants for the next thousands of years to such judgement, these scientists must refine their methods so that the judgement of those employed by governments that promote the use of nuclear energy will be in precise and objective agreement with the judgement of equally qualified scientists who are employed by universities or environmentalist groups.

I note several issues that did not receive the emphasis they deserve. One is the matter of proximity. The proposed dumping site is just 600 miles north of the Northern Mariana Islands, a point of importance, of course, but not of overwhelming importance since the ecology of the ocean is not bounded by miles. The tragedy that followed the dumping of mercury wastes by Japanese industries, proved this. Not only did mercury turn up in the bodies of Japanese citizens who were made severely ill by it, but mercury was found in tuna and swordfish throughout Micronesia, and in fish cakes made in Hawaii. This lesson must not be forgotten or put aside by specious data derived from laboratory exercises. Let no one overlook the fact that radioactive contamination of the Pacific Ocean and its food chain threatens every person who lives on any island north of the equator, south of the equator, east or west of the International Date Line. We islanders understand this and see the proposed dumping and its possible interference with our way of life as a form of heedless, even arrogant, aggression against those human rights that we regard as inalienable and unpurchasable. This threat unites us in common cause and crusade, and we ask the Government of Japan, and, especially the People of Japan, to abandon this proposed experiment that threatens the meagre resources that we have in 'the Ocean that feeds us.'

Association of Pacific Basin Executives

PRESENTATION

by

Governor CARLOS S. CAMACHO

ENERGY ISSUES

Two great concerns to CNMI and, I assume, to all the U.S. island territories have been presented to the members of this forum, and have been addressed to Mr. Wallace Green of the Department of the Interior, and other interested officials in Washington.

The first issue is the need for the establishment of a Territorial Energy Policy. The CNMI position paper on the National Energy Policy proposed by the National Governors' Association shows that the needs of the U.S. mainland and the U.S. island territories are completely different. It is therefore, a matter of extreme urgency that we have our own Territorial Energy Policy, so that we can claim our fair share of the billions of dollars from the Windfall Profits Tax without any delay.

I strongly recommend that all our energy officials and the experts from the Federal agencies get together as soon as possible to work on the Territorial Energy Policy. We do not want any more surveys or reports on our energy problems or resources, as we already know what we have and what we want. We want positive action now to make our islands energy independent through the development of our abundant and renewable resources. I propose a unified effort to formulate such a Territorial Policy to be sent to the DOI, DOE, Congress and President.

The second issue is the proposed Energy Management Partnership Act (EMPA), which still limits the purchase of equipment and hardware to 20%. This has prevented us, under the existing energy laws, from demonstrating energy conservation measures and utilizing our local energy resources in our small islands.

It is important that such a clause be removed from EMPA, or made more flexible in the case of island territories. Moreover, until EMPA becomes law, we should explore the possibility of waiving this clause under the Territorial Omnibus Act, as many islands are having difficulty with their Energy Extension Services program because up to 80% of the limited funds have been earmarked for demonstration purposes.

I sincerely hope that you will all support these two issues, and that we can get some quick and appropriate action from Washington soon, as it is a question of survival for our island communities.



Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Office of the Governor
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950

FOR OFFICIAL USE
CABLE ADDRESS
GOV. NSM SAIPAN
REPLY TO:

DEPT. or ACTIVITY

QUESTIONS

ON NUCLEAR DUMPING BY JAPAN

SUBMITTED BY: CARLOS S. CAMACHO
GOVERNOR
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN
MARIANA ISLANDS

1. A MAJOR PRINCIPLE UNDERLYING JAPAN'S POLICY OF NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT IS THAT - "UTMOST PRECAUTION MUST BE TAKEN TO ASSURE THE SAFETY OF THE PUBLIC AND TO PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT." IN WHAT WAY DOES YOUR OCEAN DUMPING PROPOSAL ASSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND PRESERVATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT?

2. PREAMBLE: *In a memo from a Japanese official, it was stated that "The environmental safety of sea-dumping has been thoroughly examined and the Japanese Nuclear Safety Commission has assured its safety..." In a recent report completed by the Office of Radiation Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, it was stated that the scientific predictive capability for the movement of radio-activity released from drums into deepsea areas is clearly lacking. For the Japanese Government to make the unequivocal assurance of safety it has, some very special scientific predictive capabilities must have been developed to ascertain the movement of release radioactivity from the proposed dump site."*

WOULD YOU DESCRIBE WHAT JAPAN'S SCIENTIFIC PREDICTIVE CAPABILITIES FOR THE MOVEMENT OF RADIO-ACTIVITY RELEASED FROM DRUMS INTO DEEPSEA AREAS ARE AND HOW THESE CAPABILITIES HAVE BEEN USED TO TRACK AND ASSESS THE MOVEMENT OF RADIO-ACTIVITY WHICH WILL EVENTUALLY BE RELEASED FROM THE BARRELS AT THE PROPOSED DUMP SITE?

3. PREAMBLE: *In the same memo referred to above, it states that full-scale dumping of low-level radioactive wastes will be carried out only after safety has been confirmed by oceanographic surveys of radio-active levels in marine products, the sea water, and the sediment which may result from the experimental dumping. It is my understanding that these surveys will be conducted over the two-year "experimental-dumping period." At the end of this period, full-scale dumping will commence if environmental safety has been confirmed.*

HOW CAN YOU HOPE TO KNOW THE FULL IMPLICATIONS OF YOUR DUMPING ON THE OCEAN ENVIRONMENT AFTER SPENDING ONLY TWO SHORT YEARS STUDYING THE EFFECTS OF SMALL-SCALE, EXPERIMENTAL NUCLEAR-WASTE DUMPING?

4. HOW DO YOU INTEND TO STUDY THE EFFECTS OF RELEASED RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS ON MIGRATORY SPECIES OF MARINE LIFE PASSING THROUGH, OR WHICH HAVE CONSUMED CONTAMINATED MATERIALS WHICH HAVE PASSED THROUGH THE PROPOSED DUMP-SITE?

5. PREAMBLE: *A conclusion made 18 years ago by a working group of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council, which the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency says holds true today, states:*

"There is no evidence that this disposal practice has resulted in any inimical effect upon the environment; but neither is there evidence that harmful effects cannot eventually result from it. The concern here is not with any magnitudes of disposal already undertaken, but rather with understanding the implications of the continuing and increasing use of the oceans as a receptacle for disposal. History is replete with cases in which unrestricted pollution of various kinds, rapidly developing from innocuous beginnings, has subtly damaged or destroyed resources before understanding and controls could be developed.

The truth of this statement cannot be argued.

WHAT SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDINGS HAVE YOU DEVELOPED TO ASSURE US THAT MARINE RESOURCES WILL NOT BE SUBTLY DAMAGED OR DESTROYED AS YOU CONTINUE AND INCREASINGLY USE THE PROPOSED DUMP-SITE AS A RECEPTACLE FOR DISPOSAL?

6. IN A REPORT RELEASED BY YOUR GOVERNMENT, IT WAS STATED THAT THE JAPANESE NUCLEAR SAFETY COMMISSION ASSESSED, IN 1979, THE RADIOLOGICAL IMPACT OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND FULL-SCALE SEA DUMPING OF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES. THE RESULTS OF THIS ASSESSMENT SHOWED THAT EVEN UNDER THE MOST EXTREME CONDITIONS, HUMAN EXPOSURE WOULD BE WELL WITHIN THE RANGE OF THE FLUCTUATION OF THE NATURAL RADIATION BACKGROUND. HOWEVER, IN A STATEMENT MADE BY A GROUP OF JAPANESE SCIENTISTS, ONE OF WHOM WAS THE FAMOUS JAPANESE PHYSICIST, SYU ONO, YOUR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYED A CRUDE, OVERSIMPLISTIC MODEL OF THE PACIFIC OCEAN AND THAT THE RATE OF BIOLOGICAL CONCENTRATION OF RADIONUCLIDES EMPLOYED IN THE ASSESSMENT WERE EXTREMELY UNDER-ESTIMATED AND THUS UNRELIABLE. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THESE ACCUSATIONS MADE BY YOUR OWN SCIENTISTS?
7. FOLLOWING THE EXPERIMENTAL PHASE OF THE NUCLEAR WASTE DUMPING, WHAT PLANS HAVE YOU DEVELOPED TO CONTINUE COMPLETE AND DETAILED MONITORING OF THE DUMP-SITE SHOULD FULL-SCALE DUMPING OCCUR?

8. IN THE EVENT THAT THE DUMPING IS FOUND NOT TO BE SAFE, HOW WILL THE BARRELS BE RECOVERED?
9. CAN WE BE FORWARDED COPIES, TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH, OF ALL SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS, STUDIES AND ALL RELATED DETAILS CONCERNING YOUR PROPOSED PLAN TO DUMP NUCLEAR WASTES IN THE PACIFIC FOR OUR REVIEW?
10. WE HAVE BEEN INFORMED BY OUR REPRESENTATIVE, WHO RECENTLY VISITED JAPAN, THAT AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN JAPAN AND U.S. HAS BEEN ENTERED INTO REGARDING A JOINT STUDY ON THE OCEAN DUMPING OF NUCLEAR WASTES. COULD YOU CONFIRM THIS? IF SO, COULD YOU PROVIDE US WITH A COPY OF THAT AGREEMENT?

(IF THE ANSWER IS YES)

WON'T IT BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF MUTUAL CONSULTATION AND GOOD FAITH TO WHICH THE GOVERNMENTS OF JAPAN AND U.S. HAVE SUBSCRIBED INTERNATIONALLY, TO AFFORD ALL PARTIES CONCERNED THE OPPORTUNITY OF BEING CONSULTED DIRECTLY ON SUCH AN IMPORTANT AGREEMENT BEFORE IT IS EFFECTED, ESPECIALLY TO THE ISLAND COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN SUCH AN EXPERIMENT?

11. WOULD YOU GIVE US SOME EXPLANATION, PERHAPS SCIENTIFICALLY, WHY THERE WAS AN ABRUPT STOPPAGE OF OCEAN DUMPING BY THE U.S. IN 1979, WHILE 4 MAJOR COUNTRIES CONTINUE TO DROP THEIR WASTES IN THE ATLANTIC OCEAN?

DOESN'T IT SEEM IRONIC THAT WHILE THE U.S. CEASED ITS OCEAN DUMPING OPERATION TEN YEARS AGO, DESPITE ITS CONTINUED USE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, IT WOULD NOW SEEM TO SUPPORT THE JAPANESE PROPOSAL FOR OCEAN DUMPING?

12. HAS THERE BEEN EXTENSIVE SCIENTIFIC STUDIES CONDUCTED ON THE EFFECTS OF MAJOR DUMPING OPERATIONS IN THE ATLANTIC OCEAN? IF SO, HAVE ALL DRUMS BEEN IDENTIFIED AND ACCOUNTED FOR?

WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THOSE STUDIES?

13. CORRECT ME IF I'M MISTAKEN, BUT I UNDERSTAND THAT EVEN TO THIS DATE, THERE HAS NOT BEEN ANY CONSENSUS REACHED, EVEN AMONG THE BEST MINDS IN NUCLEAR SCIENCE AROUND THE WORLD, REGARDING THE LONG TERM EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR DUMPING AND DISPOSAL AND/OR ITS RAMIFICATIONS. I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS NOT EVEN A CONSENSUS TODAY AMONG THE JAPANESE SCIENTISTS ON THIS VERY MATTER. PLEASE TRY TO EXPLAIN THIS SEEMING CONTRADICTION WITH YOUR STATEMENT OF RELIABILITY AND SAFETY BASED ON YOUR PRESENTATION THIS MORNING.
14. SHOULD YOU INITIATE YOUR FULL-SCALE WASTE WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM, WE CAN EXPECT AN AVERAGE OF 5,000 CURIES TO BE DUMPED INTO PACIFIC WATERS PER YEAR. DURING YOUR PRESENTATION, YOU MADE NO MENTION OF WHAT THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF THIS PROGRAM WILL BE OVER TIME. HAVE YOU MADE DETAILED STUDIES OF WHAT THESE

IMPACTS MIGHT BE? CAN YOU OUTLINE YOUR FINDINGS FOR US? CAN YOU PROVIDE US WITH COPIES OF THESE STUDIES?

15. IN 1954, THE UNITED STATES DETONATED HYDROGEN BOMB, BRAVO, WHICH SPEWED ITS FALLOUT ON JAPANESE SEAMEN ON THE LUCKY DRAGON, AND ON THE CITIZENS OF RONGALAP ATOLL. EVERYONE IN THIS ROOM CONDEMNS THAT AS A MAJOR SCIENTIFIC MISCALCULATION AND AS A CRUEL AND IRRESPONSIBLE THING TO HAVE DONE. BUT AT THAT TIME I AM SURE THAT THE BOMBING PROPOSAL WAS PRESENTED BY SCIENTISTS AS BEING SAFE AND JUSTIFIED AND WELL-REASONED. WELL RESEARCHED, JUST LIKE THE EXCELLENT PRESENTATIONS WE HEARD THIS MORNING! MY QUESTION IS: HOW DO YOU KNOW YOU ARE NOT PREPARING A SIMILAR HOLOCAUST FOR THOSE OF US WHO LIVE ON SMALL ISLANDS? IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, ASK THE MEMBERS OF THE MARSHALLESE DELEGATION WHO ARE AWARE OF THE DEVASTATION OF THESE KINDS OF EXPERIMENTATION. FROM SAD PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, THEY HAVE LEARNED THAT SCIENTISTS ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING SERIOUS ERRORS, AND ARE OFTEN BIASED IN THEIR ASSESSMENTS.

16. FOR MORE THAN 30 YEARS, THE PEOPLE OF THE NMI, ALONG WITH MANY OTHER PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES, HAVE THOUGHT OF THE JAPANESE PEOPLE AS CLOSE FRIENDS AND HAVE DEVELOPED A FINE SPIRIT OF COOPERATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN, NOT TO MENTION THE HISTORICAL RELATIONS THAT SOME OF THESE COUNTRIES HAD PRIOR TO WORLD WAR II. IN EXECUTING YOUR PLANS TO DUMP RADIO-ACTIVE WASTES IN PACIFIC WATERS, A MOVE WHICH 38 OUT OF ABOUT 40 EMERGING ISLAND NATIONS HAVE MOST ADAMANTLY OPPOSED, ARE THE JAPANESE PEOPLE PREPARED TO SACRIFICE THE GOOD RELATIONS AND COOPERATION THEY NOW ENJOY WITH THE PEOPLES OF THE PACIFIC BASIN?