

NUCLEAR MONITOR

A PUBLICATION OF WORLD INFORMATION SERVICE ON ENERGY (WISE)
AND THE NUCLEAR INFORMATION & RESOURCE SERVICE (NIRS)

wise
World Information Service on Energy
founded in 1978



DECEMBER 9, 2005 | No. 639

MONITORED THIS ISSUE:

SWEDISH RENEWABLES CAN REPLACE NUCLEAR BY 2020

A report released in November by the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) states that the country's renewable energy producers could produce enough power by 2020 to replace the capacity currently provided by nuclear power plants.

(639.5733) WISE Sweden - The SSNC asked Swedish energy producers how much new renewable energy capacity they could deliver to consumers by the year 2020 and the responses received indicate that there is great potential for truly clean energy systems to replace nuclear capacity as it stands.

New renewable energy capacity coupled with more effective use of energy efficiency could replace all the power currently obtained from nuclear power stations in Sweden and nearly all that from the fossil fuel industry as well. CO₂ emissions would also be reduced by 50%, not including the transport sector.

The renewable energy trade organisations released their own projections that demonstrate, with minor changes in the current national energy policy, the possibility of replacing all nuclear power and almost all use of fossil fuels within important consumer sectors like industry, service and housing.

In a press release the Secretary General of SSNC, Svante Axelsson, called on the government to let go of the unsustainable and environmentally damaging energy production industries of yesteryear, and to seriously open the way for renewable and environmentally friendly energy sources that have a future. Commenting on the report, SSNC said that the government's ambivalence

to the issue is reflected in the public's opinion. A recent poll conducted by the SIFO institute suggested that a majority of Swedish citizens, 70 percent, want renewable energy whereas just 13 percent were in favour of nuclear energy and fossil fuels, however only a fifth of those polled believed that it is possible to replace the old energy systems with new environmentally sound replacements.

The responses from renewable energy producers in Sweden

Current production of energy from sun, wind and biomass is at 11 terra watt hours (TWh) for electricity and 92 TWh for heating but by the year 2020 it is expected to rise to 88 TWh for electricity and 164 TWh for heating. The total increased renewable capacity, 252 TWh, is comparative to current levels of energy consumption in Sweden today, which stand at 311 TWh excluding the transport sector. The capacity gap between current levels of consumption and projected levels of new renewables capacity, 59 TWh, is less than that produced by hydropower to date (about 70 TWh).

Energy supplies from wind power could increase from 1 TWh today to 25 TWh but the potential for solar energy in Sweden would remain low at just 2 TWh. The renewable source with most potential is bio energy and that is projected to increase to 170 TWh. As

SWEDISH RENEWABLES CAN REPLACE NUCLEAR BY 2020	1
RESHAPING THE NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME	3
U.S. SUBSIDIES TO NUCLEAR POWER	5
HUNGARIAN MPS IN PRO NUCLEAR VOTE	6
HOW TO DO BATTLE: THE STORY OF PORT HOPE CANADA	7
SOUTH AFRICA'S PBMR NIGHTMARE CONTINUES	10
EUROPE'S SCANDALOUS NUCLEAR WASTE EXPORTS TO RUSSIA EXPOSED	11
IN BRIEF	12

important to the increase in renewable capacity is energy efficiency, which could free an estimated 62 TWh. This is the level that the European Union has said is possible and the level it wants the Union as a whole to attain.

The production capacity given by the energy producers is however conditional. In order for the suppliers to be able to provide the levels promised some pledges featured in the energy policy must be fulfilled. For example, it remains difficult to obtain permission to build wind power stations and CO2 taxes must stay at least as high as current levels and includes all industry and all combined power and heating plants - the renewable energy industry is of course exempted from this tax but so it the nuclear industry, although not

(yet) legally recognised as clean energy (thankfully), it is taxed differently from other polluting industries.

According to SSNC, the demands made by renewable energy producers are not especially far-reaching or politically difficult to deliver. But the impact on the environment will be huge, with a likely decline of 50% in carbon dioxide emissions.

Climate change is a global problem, which will require a truly global solution but instead of waiting for others to act, SSNC is calling on Sweden to take a leadership role immediately. The organization wants Sweden's politicians and companies to work towards inspiring others and instigating real progress in the international arena.

Few countries are as well positioned as Sweden to create a society built on renewable energy. We are relatively rich in bio-fuel, mostly in the form of waste products from the forestry industry, we have great potential to use energy more effectively and we have a good geographical location to exploit wind power. The only thing we seem to lack is brave politicians.

Source: Report from the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation, November 2005 (Available in Swedish at <http://www.snf.se/pdf/rap-klimat-energipusslet.pdf>)

Contact: Eia Liljegren-Palmaer, WISE Sweden at Info@folkkampanjen.se

APOLOGIES

Under the heading "Good and bad news from the European Parliament", the short piece sub-headed "Support for nukes post-Kyoto?" in our last issue (#638) contained several errors and incorrect assessments that we would now like to correct.

Firstly, Anders Wijkman MEP belongs to the Christian Democratic Party (Conservatives) and not to the Liberal Party.

Secondly, while Mr. Wijkman was indeed nominated for Parliament Magazine's MEP Awards 2005 in the environment category, the award he actually won was for Achiever of the Year.

Thirdly, it was wrong to suggest that Mr. Wijkman is an

avid promoter of nuclear energy who would seek to forward such views at the COP negotiations in Montreal. Anders Wijkman has in fact supported several anti nuclear votes in the EU parliament and has stated (in the October 17 edition of Parliament Magazine) that, given the alternative technologies available, he could not argue for the major expansion of nuclear capacity in order to reduce carbon emissions. However, he also stated in the article that the nuclear option should be kept open and that research continues into improving safety and solving the problem of nuclear waste disposal.

Finally, we would like to apologise to Michel Raquet who was not the source of any of the misleading comments made in the article and who is at complete odds with the judgements made therein.

"Let us glow"

by Indian Point (U.S.) activists
(To the tune of "Let it Snow")

The evacuation plan is frightful
But the profits are so delightful
And since we have no place to go
Let us glow let us glow let us glow!

When the sirens don't work we worry
But there's really no need to hurry
Since we have no place to go
Let us glow let us glow let us glow!

When it's finally sealed up tight
Our homes will still be lit and warm
And we'll peacefully sleep at night

Like the people who protested
Shoreham

Though the plants are slowly dying
The owners aren't good-byeing
And as long as they love them so
Let us glow let us glow let us glow!

"Atomic Courtesy"

by Ethel Jacobson

To smash the simple atom
All mankind was intent.
Now any day
The atom may
Return the compliment

WISE AMSTERDAM/NIRS

ISSN: 1570-4629

Reproduction of this material is encouraged. Please give credit when reprinting.

Editorial team: Tinu Otoki and Peer de Rijk (WISE Amsterdam), Michael Mariotte (NIRS).

With **contributions** from Earthlife Africa, Energy Club, Gary Oliver, PENN-N, Tom and Pat Lawson and WISE Sweden.

The next issue (640) will be mailed out on December 23, 2005.

RESHAPING THE NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME

The process apparently shaping the 'Iranian nuclear crisis' evidently has more ramifications than meet the eye. In fact the Iranian case could be considered a smoke screen for some far-reaching changes in the treaty arrangements regarding the proliferation of nuclear technology.

(639.5734) PENN-N - The issue of Iran's alleged efforts to build nuclear weapons has always been a very controversial matter and the way in which the nuclear weapons states (NWS) and their allies have approached it is in itself significant.

The negotiating stance taken by the EU3 of France, Germany and Britain (See *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* 625.5673 "Iran - an exercise in double standards") undermines the IAEA's basic underlying premise that it is possible to control the misuse of nuclear technology for the construction of nuclear weapons. EU negotiators, unofficially backed by the US and a series of Israeli military threats, have made it clear to Iran that it will not be allowed access to the full nuclear cycle; i.e. to develop the capacity for uranium enrichment. This position became clear during the bilateral negotiations between Iran and the EU3 when an offer by the Iranian government (1) to allow enrichment under extra safeguards was rejected. The counteroffer, which would have allowed the supply of enriched fuel from a source outside Iran, was regarded as unacceptable by the Tehran's negotiators. Talks finally broke down at the beginning of August when Iran announced the resumption of the pre-enrichment production stage; i.e. the conversion of uranium hexafluoride.

Iran's position hardened further when, in August, its newly elected government appointed a new chief nuclear negotiator to the IAEA. This was followed by a technical report to the IAEA Board on September 2 (2), which set the stage for the passing of a controversial resolution at the Board meeting on September 24 (3). A clause in this resolution refers to "Iran's many failures and breaches of its obligations to comply with its safeguards agreements", which was interpreted as

making the referral of Iran's case to the UN Security Council possible. Only Venezuela opposed the resolution, which was passed in an unusual vote by the Board (such decisions are usually taken by consensus). Russia, China and members of the Non-Aligned Movement abstained. India surprisingly voted for the resolution.

The abstentions of Russia and China and the Indian vote had by far the most far-reaching political consequences. Russia and China have long been regarded as supporters of Iran, which implied that they would oppose any attempt to refer Iran's case to the UN Security Council. After all, such a referral logically sets the stage for a repeat of the American 'diplomacy' used in the run-up to the Iraqi war. That is to say, a veto by either Russia or China would clear the way for a unilateral US policy, assuming that such vetoes would in fact be wielded. Abstentions instead of no-votes at the Board as well as developments elsewhere would suggest that the Russian, and perhaps also the Chinese, position may have changed.

The Russian deal

By early November, a definitive referral to the Security Council by a decision of the Board meeting on November 24 was expected. However, two weeks before that date, Russia introduced a so-called compromise proposal that entailed Iranian investment in an enrichment facility in Russia, which would then provide fuel to be exported to Iran while still permitting uranium conversion to take place in the country (4).

In fact this was a variant of the EU3 proposal: it differed by allowing the conversion within Iran while directly involving Russia. This was a political ploy, apparently based on a 'behind the scenes' agreement made in the

preceding weeks through the shuttle diplomacy of US foreign minister Condoleezza Rice. The plan was to extract the same concessions from Iran, but now through the good offices of Russia, which has for many years been involved with the construction of the Bushehr nuclear reactor and therefore directly interested in Iran's nuclear program. The official Iranian reaction to the new proposal seemed negative (5), which was logical since the compromise could only have been regarded as capitulation by the Iranians who have insisted on full nuclear sovereignty on a number of recent occasions. However, other Iranian voices (6) have used carefully ambivalent language about the proposal.

These manoeuvres took place as new information on the Iranian nuclear programme, from US-sourced documents purportedly providing further proof of Iranian bomb-making plans, was published on November 12. However, a US atomic expert issued a critical response to the report through Reuters two days later.

A new IAEA report on Iran presented by Dr. ElBaradei on November 18 failed to ease doubts about the nuclear programme. But on November 20, just days before the conference, EU diplomats let it be known that there would be no referral and the next day offered to resume the talks with Iran, which had stopped in August. This guarded reaction was sufficient to stop the Iran issue being put on the agenda of the IAEA Board meeting later that month. By November 27, EU foreign ministers had agreed to renew the talks with Iran and now all appears to depend on the outcome of negotiations to be resumed in the course of December. The next formal point of possible crisis is the March Board meeting.

Indian manoeuvres

As previously noted, it was the Indian vote at the September Board meeting that caused the greatest surprise, and even indignation, amongst the supporters of the Iranian case. Despite Indian disavowals after the vote (7) it seemed clear that there had been a shift in Indian policy, which had previously been illustrated during Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's visit to Washington on July 18. On that occasion the US and Indian government made a joint statement, which provided for the lifting of certain restrictions on the trading of American nuclear technology with India.

India is an unofficial nuclear weapons state and not a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The US, on the other hand, is a member and claims to support the NPT. Furthermore, it has actively pursued a number of measures like the Proliferation Security Initiative (8) and Security Council resolution 1540 (9) because it sees this as a way of operationalising the NPT, primarily as a treaty against proliferation. Furthermore the US is a leading member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which at its June plenary meeting in Oslo "reiterated firm support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty" and "Called on all states to exercise extreme vigilance and make best efforts to ensure that none of their exports of goods and technologies contribute to nuclear weapons programmes". (10)

According to Nuclear News (11), the US-India agreement contains no Indian commitments to restrain fissile material production, let alone stop it. The commitments to drop restrictions on the export of nuclear technology made by the Bush government to India will still have to pass through the US Congress. At a hearing before the House International Relations Committee on November 16, the obvious contradiction was pointed out. How could the US enter into an agreement in which a part of the Indian nuclear infrastructure was declared to be non-civilian; that is, not subject to IAEA safeguards? This effectively means that technology delivered to the civilian part of the programme could simply be passed on to the military or bomb making part of the infrastructure

and that existing fissile material production for military purposes could also continue.

This Bush administration deal with India clearly contradicts the demands placed on Iran. That some states are allowed nuclear weapons and others are not. Such selective application of non-proliferation policy obviously wrecks the idea that a treaty should be universal and not selectively applied.

Such contradictions undoubtedly informed the IAEA director ElBaradei's call for international control of key parts of the nuclear fuel cycle, specifically through the setting up of an international nuclear fuel bank, which would result in some countries with a nuclear industry foregoing some rights of access to nuclear technology (12). Unfortunately that begs the question of whether it is acceptable to only apply such controls to new nuclear states and not to the existing ones.

The other noteworthy positions are those of Russia and China. Russia appears to be playing a key role in the negotiations between the EU3 and Iran and if it persists in maintaining its proposal (for Iranian nuclear fuel to be enriched in Russia), then that strongly suggests its agreement with the US-EU3 position that restrictions must be placed on the Iranian infrastructure. Although there was a partial Iranian rejection Russia's proposal, the Iranian Bushehr reactor is dependent on the Russians for its operation so Moscow does have a certain amount of influence. In August, an Iranian spokesman announced that, after many years of delays, Bushehr would start operating in late 2006 (13). The situation obviously provides opportunities for Russia to apply political pressure on Iran, perhaps with an eye on the 'compromise' offer. The situation is similar to that between China and North Korea where the dependence of North Korea on China for vital oil deliveries provides China with some leverage.

The non-proliferation regime.

From the very start of the nuclear age it was quite clear that there would be a proliferation problem. Furthermore, that the proliferation of nuclear technology

was closely tied to that of nuclear weapons. As the first has been actively encouraged, it has worked to counter attempts, like the NPT, to limit the second. This is not news but the active acknowledgement of the problem by the US government and the director of the IAEA is a relatively new phenomena. In the past the nuclear weapons states and their allies have dealt this with surreptitiously. That is why it was possible for Israel, India and Pakistan to arm themselves with nuclear weapons. Their programmes reflect the foreign policy objectives of the states that gave them the required technology. As a study by the Congressional Research Service concluded in the case of Pakistan, "U.S. nuclear non-proliferation objectives towards Pakistan (and India) have repeatedly been subordinated to other U.S. goals. During the 1980s, Pakistan successfully exploited its importance as a conduit for aid to the anti-Soviet Afghan mujahideen to deter the imposition of economic and military sanctions that were prescribed by U.S. nuclear non-proliferation laws." (14)

That explains the leeway given to the Pakistani government to develop its Bomb through the work of the Khan network (See also *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* 602.5573 "Proliferation: focus on enrichment issues" and 603.5575 "Khan: the Dutch connection"). Today it is the reason why the US is moving towards a policy of acknowledging India as an honorary nuclear weapons state, possibly with Russian consent. There also seems to be a consensus amongst the NWS that Iran should not be allowed any nuclear infrastructure that could give it the basis for nuclear bomb construction.

Such political analysis naturally raises one last vital question; what is the Chinese position? Its abstention at the September vote seems to imply that Beijing has also decided to block the Iranian nuclear programme. According to one report, the US is indeed encouraging other nuclear weapons states to support a declaration claiming that Iran has the intent to build nuclear weapons (15).

For the anti-nuclear NGO community such a development throws up a

quandary. The blocking of any nuclear programme is desirable but if this is done as part of a grander geo-political design, subordinated to the foreign policy aims of the nuclear weapons states, then such a development also means that the foundation of multilateral treaties, i.e. the concept of shared collective security, is being systematically destroyed. The question is not only judicial but is also a practical one: every country that has nuclear aspirations will redouble its efforts to attain them before some shift in the foreign policy of the nuclear weapons states blocks their efforts.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the US government continues to keep all options open by not being directly involved with the EU3 negotiations. US Secretary of State Rice has carefully denied reports of being involved in the EU-Russia deal (16) further reflecting the unilateralist approach of the US government who's agenda is broader than stopping Iran's nuclear weapons programme. By not giving any non-aggression guarantees, the US keeps open the option of a military attack on Iran, perhaps in cooperation with Israel.

In the most extreme attack scenarios leaked from Washington (the draft of the 'Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations' (17)), such an attack plan would, in certain circumstances, also involve the use of nuclear weapons. Some argue that this is made possible by the IAEA's September resolution declaring that Iran was not to be in compliance with the NPT. Whatever the truth of such allegations, Israeli threats have continued, perhaps in response to those recently made against it by the Iranian president. At the end of November the head of Israeli military intelligence declared that Israel must be prepared to use non-diplomatic means to halt Iran's "nuclear weapons programme" (18)

Sources:

1. Written in March 2005 - see Letter Iran to Director general of the IAEA: Verbal Note No.350-1-17/928- Vienna- 1 August 2005
2. <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2005/gov2005-67.pdf>
3. <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2005/gov2005-77.pdf>
4. *Financial Times*, November 10, 2005
5. Reuters, November 11, 2005, quoting Ali Larijani, the Iranian head of delegation at the IAEA

6. Iranmania, November 15, 2005, quoting Aladdin Borujerdi, parliamentary committee chairman
7. <http://in.rediff.com/news/2005/sep/25iran.htm>
8. <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/PSI.asp>
9. Which "decided that all States shall refrain from supporting by any means non-State actors that attempt to acquire, use or transfer nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their delivery systems." <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc8076.doc.htm>
10. <http://www.nuclearsuppliersgroup.org/PRESS/2005-06-oslo.pdf>
11. Nuclear News, November 24, 2005
12. BBC News, November 8, 2005
13. BBC News, August 22, 2004
14. Pakistan's Nuclear Proliferation Activities and the Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission: U.S. Policy Constraints and Options January 25, 2005; CRS Report for Congress
15. *IHT*, December 5, 2005
16. BBC World Service, November 10, 2005
17. For documents and analysis of doctrine:<http://www.nukestrat.com/us/jcs/jp.htm>
18. *Jerusalem Post*, November 30, 2005

Contact: Karel Koster, Project on European Nuclear Non-Proliferation (PENN/N), Obrechtstraat 43, 3572 EC Utrecht, the Netherlands.
E-mail: k.koster@inter.nl.net
Tel: +31 30 271 4376

U.S. SUBSIDIES TO NUCLEAR POWER

Earth Track has released updated information on the magnitude of subsidies to nuclear power in the United States. This material was presented at a recent symposium on nuclear power and climate change hosted by the Nuclear Policy Research Institute.

Among the major findings;

- (1) Nuclear power continues to be uneconomic without large government subsidies
- (2) Federal subsidies for new plants are worth 4 to 8 cents per kWh (levelized cost basis) of nuclear-generated electricity, 60-90% of the generation cost for a new plant. Thus, the public is paying the majority of the cost of these new plants, though the investors will retain all of the profits if the plants are successful.
- (3) Studies on the economics of nuclear power over the past few years routinely ignore baseline subsidies (worth 0.8-4.2 c/kWh) to nuclear in their calculations of economic viability of the technology. Many also use unrealistic assumptions for the cost of capital.
- (4) The Price-Anderson Act, which limits investor liability for damages that nuclear accidents cause the surrounding population, provides coverage of diminishing value.
- (5) Coverage levels for individual reactors have increased only 10% in real terms since 1975, despite massive growth in the value of off-site property and in the numbers of people surrounding plants.
- (6) Coverage levels purchased by at least some firms to protect their own nuclear plant, equipment, and businesses in the event of an accident are TEN TIMES the coverage levels they hold to protect the surrounding population in the case of an accident.
- (7) Retrospective premiums, making up the bulk of the private liability under Price-Anderson, are at increasing risk from changes in the corporate structure under which commercial plants are held, and by consolidation of operating units under a single parent.

The full report can be accessed at:

http://www.earthtrack.net/earthtrack/library/NuclearSubsidies2005_NPRI.ppt

HUNGARIAN MPS IN PRO NUCLEAR VOTE

Following an 18-minute meeting on September 7, the Hungarian government made a request to the Minister of Justice (in charge of nuclear issues) to prepare a proposal to Parliament on the planned radioactive waste repository at Bataapati, and on the planned lifetime extension (PLEX) of the Paks nuclear power plant.

(639.5735) Energia Klub - The resulting resolution proposed gave the preliminary approval required to begin preparations for the construction of a low and middle level radioactive waste repository and for the extension of the operational life of the Paks NPP.

The resolution text was full of errors and incorrect data and while it did seek to explain its very existence, it failed to clarify why the separate issues of PLEX and the approval of a waste repository were treated as one matter. The law stipulates the necessity for parliamentary approval where preparations for the construction of radioactive waste repositories are concerned but does not extend to the issue of PLEX. A preliminary law making is required to allow for a parliamentary discussion on matters concerning the future of Paks, although none was made before Parliament did indeed debate the issue. Further, no decisions should be made and certainly not before the introduction of a long-term energy strategy.

The ambiguous language used in the Atomic Law (116/1996) concerning theoretical approval of radioactive waste repositories contains phrases such as "preparation activities" and "construction of the repository" that are not defined and it is this lack of clarity that allows the law to be abused. The State Court of Auditors has also uttered this criticism.

Prior to the proposal's discussion, it was reviewed by two parliamentary committees - one for the environmental, the other economic. Energy Club sent an open letter to the environment committee on October 6, including fact sheets on the problems related to the Bataapati project and the PLEX of Paks. The organization also attended both committee meetings in order to ensure its views were heard as well as forwarding those from Austria, which in line with the Espoo Convention sent

comments on the EIA for the PLEX. The committee's performed their evaluations of the proposal on October 25 and all four political parties voted in favour except for two opposition party (FIDESZ) MPs in the environment committee.

On November 3, Energy Club then sent an open letter, signed by 21 environmental organizations, to all MPs asking them to reject the proposal - the group received no responses to date. Energy Club and another green group, Védegylet, also held a press conference to focus attention on the letter highlight and the issue. Days later, the two organizations initiated an advertisement campaign featuring the signatures of 80 well known Hungarians (environmentalists, journalists, scientists, artists etc.) carrying the message "There are only alternatives to Paks" (referring to the nuclear lobby's claims that there are no alternatives) that was published in the leading Hungarian daily Népszabadság, and which later also ran in another daily, Magyar Hírlap, and three weekly newspapers. This was quite a coup given the difficulties the groups had encountered in getting the ad campaign published at all! The main opposition (conservative) daily refused it without giving any reasons, as did the Magyar Hírlap at first, although it did make reference to commercial interests in its explanation (Paks being amongst their most important advertisers) but followed suite once Népszabadság had run the ad. The fact that a press release had been issued announcing the campaign and naming the newspapers refusing to print the paid advertisement helped cause a scandal and likely helped force the newspapers' change of heart.

On the same day, Parliament began general discussions on the resolution proposal but since four modification proposals (prepared by Energy Club as one modification but split into four by

MPs) were submitted to the original resolution, no vote could be taken. The debate lasted for just over two hours and in that time only one MP, Zoltan Illes of the opposite party (Fidesz, Young Democrats) voiced opposition to PLEX.

The two most important modifications - one of which rejects the Bataapati scheme and does not modify Paks, the other one vice versa - were accepted by the environmental committee on November 10. Interestingly, none of the government's MPs on the committee showed up to vote but the opposition members came out in favour of the two modifications, which was strange considering that the opposition is also in favour of PLEX. The economical committee did however vote against the modifications.

A detailed debate lasting one hour and a half, including the modifications, was held in Parliament on November 14 and consisted of Zoltan Illes arguing against the whole Parliament. Seven days later the vote on the modifications was finally held. The first modification, which excludes the Bataapati part, but leaves PLEX unchanged, gained 7 "yes" votes (out of the 386 MPs) and 4 abstentions, the second modification got 10 "yes" votes and 8 abstentions, thus neither modification was accepted. This was followed by a vote on the proposal's original text and this was accepted with 339 'yes' votes, 4 'no's' and 8 abstentions.

The discussions during the general and detailed debate were preposterous. The pro nuclear MPs kept repeating the same unreliable mantra over and over - that Hungary needs Paks for electricity, that renewables are too expensive to replace nuclear, that Paks would help fulfil Kyoto targets. There was no response to the questions posed and facts provided by Zoltan Illes and no other voices of opposition.

It seems that a political decision has been made and that the political elite have succeeded in pushing this proposal through parliament rapidly, excluding the public from the decision-making process. The entire process was completely undemocratic. Energy Club was not given the opportunity to express its opposition fully as it was only allowed to address the economic committee meeting for a few minutes - the committee chair was irritated at having to allow it at all, claiming that the public debate was long over and that Energy Club should have spoken then, which was ridiculous since no

public hearing was ever held on those specific issues.

The most shocking aspect of the proposal being approved is that the PLEX of Paks was agreed despite the fact that the government has no political energy concept! It has made a decision on this huge issue determining Hungary's energy policy for the next 30 years, without having a clue about what the country's energy needs might be over the next ten years, let alone thirty. Without conducting a single study or analysing any data on energy consumption or supplies, MPs of all parties (with the exception of Mr Illes)

have shown themselves to be vulnerable to the manipulations of the nuclear lobby by voting in favour of the lifetime extension of a dangerous nuclear power plant instead of casting their vote for the betterment of Hungary and its citizens.

Source and contact: Zsuzsanna Koritár, Energia Klub, 1056 Budapest, Szerb u. 17-19, Hungary
E-mail: Koritarzs@energiaklub.hu
Tel: +36 1 411 35 22
Fax: +36 1 411 35 29
Web: www.energiaklub.hu

HOW TO DO BATTLE: THE STORY OF PORT HOPE CANADA

In many ways, Port Hope, an Ontario town of 16,000 residents on the shores of Lake Ontario, is idyllic. Its 19th Century main street is celebrated as an unspoiled architectural gem, its Ganaraska River as a fishing paradise with its rolling hills and rural surroundings still fighting off urban sprawl. On the other hand, this beautiful town suffers from a debilitating stigma, that of being a dumpsite for radioactive nuclear waste.


(639.5736) Tom and Pat Lawson - Sixty years of radioactive and toxic contamination has scared off potential job creation enterprises in Port Hope, and led to a CA\$250 million (US\$215 million) federal plan to clean up the waste scattered throughout the community. Cameco Corporation's nuclear fuel facility continues to dominate, deface, and pollute the waterfront. A minor employer, THE major polluter, most of its employees living outside town, yet many townspeople are hardly able to imagine the town without it.

This town has a long history of informed grassroots activism. In 1972 it fought off a massive scheme to dump Toronto's garbage just west of town. Ontario's Regional Government initiative ran into Port Hope citizens' stonewall. In 1995 a Federal Task Force spent CA\$1 million (around US\$ 860,000) on bribery and blackmail to persuade the townspeople to allow a million tons of radioactive and toxic waste to be buried right under the town's shoreline in 19 caverns. Again the townspeople rallied to challenge these "Pirates of Port Hope", and, after an epic struggle, fought off the "Crazy Caverns".

The most recent challenge has been Cameco's proposal to process enriched uranium (SEU) at its Port Hope facility. Once again the people have rallied. A door-to-door blitz by Families Against Radiation Exposure (FARE) recruited 1600 members, and a carefully crafted campaign has brought the SEU proposal to a grinding halt. Simultaneously, two other citizen groups, the Environmental Nuclear Watchdogs and the Community Health Concerns

Committee, have made substantial headway in monitoring Cameco's activities, and in demanding a genuine health study of local people; Past studies, all inconclusive by design, have measured contamination levels against "acceptable" levels, which shift with politics.

These campaigns are never easy. The industry has enviable resources, involving about 20 identifiable techniques (see below) to vacuum up key figures and marginalize opposition. Their Regulator, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), trumpets its Mission as the Health and Safety of the People, but every decision it has made shows that its Mission is really the health and safety of the nuclear industry.



Cameco, of course, does whatever will provide maximum profit for its shareholders. Its "charitable" activities in the community must never go beyond what will make it look like a Good Corporate Citizen. As with all corporations, altruistic charity is not an option. The only reason Cameco decided to withdraw its application to process SEU in Port Hope was that FARE's tactics finally made it more profitable to process SEU elsewhere - in the US.

Top Tips

During the 1995 Crazy Caverns crisis, we listed the following techniques through which the "Pirates of Port Hope" attempted to implement their insane scheme.

1. Vacuum up Mayor, Council, Chamber of Commerce, and local media via sophisticated 'palm dusting'.
2. Promise community participation, ensuring it will be mere window dressing.
3. Hire, at whatever cost, the best lawyer available as key spokesperson.
4. Draft (again at whatever cost) a resident "Information Officer" to peddle your lawyer's propaganda.
5. Promote division within the community.
6. Set up negotiations for compensation, keeping it fuzzy till success is assured.
7. Hold Open Houses (NEVER debates) with "experts" and carefully doctored questionnaires.
8. Use sophisticated bribery and blackmail throughout.
9. Never attend public meetings organized by citizens ("Prior commitments").
10. Enlist local press with full-page ads, prewritten articles, and pressure to "balance" Letters to the Editor. Above all, keep publicity local.
11. Send Councillors abroad "to inspect similar facilities".
12. Use personal attacks on citizen leaders when unable to handle their arguments.
13. Release the real facts in drips and drabs, and only when necessary.
14. If necessary, fabricate and boost a "Yes" Committee even if it has no support.
15. If failure looms, preplan a way out with dignity (e.g. Inadequate compensation).
16. NEXT TIME, engineer a binding legal agreement with Council rather than a referendum.

Here is a summary of how John Ralston Saul, in his 1992 book *Voltaire's Bastards*, describes these "Pirates", these technocrat/bureaucrats who have come to wield such powerful influence in government and business circles:

"These people concentrate on structure, accounting, reporting, manoeuvring, and mastery of detail. Precision and hard work are their prime virtues. They are devoted to the service of established power. They are systems men. They operate within and through the systems that make it almost impossible for the Law to judge illegal that which is wrong."

"The whole colossal arms industry that is creating hell throughout the world is an extension of this kind of thinking. The best way to make an arms industry economically viable is to produce larger runs of each weapon, and to sell the

surplus abroad, wherever there are buyers, including enemies and potential enemies. Thus we achieve the largest market in the history of the world. Pure reason, yes, but common sense?"

"The technocrat's bizarre management method consists of attempting at all costs to initiate any dialogue, using massive quantities of information, enormous briefing books, a sea of facts, to create confusion and exhaust critics. Facts and figures parade as signs of honesty, charts and graphs as indicators of inevitability. All are chosen arbitrarily to produce a given solution. This is the technocrat's rhetoric: a replacement of elegance by suffocating bafflegab."

"Imagination, creativity, knowledge, a social conscience - all these wither. With no room for any real link between reason, common sense, and morality, is it any wonder that an educated public responds with growing distrust, resentment, and finally outrage?"

How do concerned citizens protect their communities against such pressure? Here are some guidelines the citizens of Port Hope used to win the Crazy Caverns battle:

1. Expect to be outspent and misrepresented as ill informed, emotional, negative.
2. Avoid careless errors; do your homework; have alternatives.
3. Demand real participation. On your terms.
4. Do not attack the media. Educate it. Use it.
5. Reject Workshops, Open Houses, Kitchen Committees. Demand formal, structured debate.
6. Find legal mechanisms to make new standards apply to old facilities.
7. Avoid mud slinging and the Orwellian bafflegab of the proponent.
8. Persevere! They depend on wearing you down.
9. Always visualize success. Say their scheme "would be", never "will be".
10. Never prejudge what will tip the scales in your favour. Expect surprises.
11. Expect them to use compensation (fuzzy or real) to kill debate.
12. Get people to bring something to meetings. They'll turn up!
13. Use humorous ridicule (never nasty) as a prime weapon. Get a cartoonist!
14. Campaign without ego. Laugh at yourselves. Forget who takes credit.
15. Devise powerful slogans (e.g. "Ignorance is toxic")
16. Involve all kinds of people. Share power.
17. Keep asking questions. It's win-win. Just publicize any refusal to answer.
18. Be ambitious in fundraising.
19. Be intensely local, but large in vision.
20. Lure a respected celebrity to town. (Handwrite your appeal for help).
21. Letters to the Editor, and to political reps. Flood them! Get into major media.
22. LAWN SIGNS, CAR STICKERS, FLYERS, a FILM

During the SEU battle, FARE has been fortunate in having among its members a key municipal Councillor, a brilliant researcher, several experienced lawyers with substantial understanding of government processes, and a considerable body of informed, passionately committed citizens.

A key element in its strategy has been to inundate the nuclear industry and its regulator with a sea of questions that must be answered before plans can be implemented. When 20 citizens travelled to Ottawa, at their own expense, to express their concerns to the Regulator, the session lasted from 8.30 am to 1 am, with no break for supper! But during that 16-hour marathon, it became clear that the nuclear staff, on whom the Commissioners depend, had simply not informed the Commissioners on at least one key issue.

Then, when the Regulator agreed to come to Port Hope, it was faced with the prospect, not of 20, but of over 100 "Interventions". These included an extraordinary body of highly informed scientific material, all requiring response, and much of it seriously damaging to the reputation of the Regulator. The visit was cancelled, and Cameco removed its application to process SEU in Port Hope. It was a classic case of ordinary citizens in one small town bringing a powerful corporation to its knees on a key issue. A memorable FARE party followed!

Of course, winning a battle and winning a war are two different things. For example, Cameco, moving elsewhere to process SEU "more profitably", intends to bring it back into Port Hope to be encased in fuel rods. And, having learned nothing from the Crazy Caverns fiasco of 1995 other than how to avoid the tactics that failed in Port Hope, they have launched a similar project twice as big at Kincardine on the Bruce Peninsula. They have changed their rhetoric from "Out-of-sight, Out-of-mind Disposal" to


"Monitored and Retrievable Storage", but the project remains much the same, engineered by the same dedicated "Pirates".

Perhaps most disturbing, the same Port Hope individuals who spearheaded the Crazy Caverns are in charge of selling a CA\$250 million government scheme to concentrate all Port Hope's known radioactive and toxic wastes in a questionable proposed dump just west of town. The proponents, like foxes in charge of the chicken coop, control the environmental assessment. They have even sent the co-opted mayor abroad to trumpet Port Hope's "solution" in Europe without a shovel having gone into the ground. The citizens are demanding an independent Panel Review.

So the war goes on! No farewell to arms. No free lunch. No time even for a respite. But no boredom! And Port Hope's concerned citizens are not going to disappear. When you love your community, and it is in trouble, running away is no option.

Contact: Tom and Pat Lawson, lawson@eagle.ca

Tom and Pat are local residents who have campaigned on environmental issues for over four decades between them. Pat, an activist for over 30 years, is running for the Green Party in the upcoming elections having been passed the baton by Tom who stood during the last three elections. Her commitment and involvement in community issues has earned Pat numerous honours from local, provincial and federal bodies. She also researched Penny Sager's Blind Faith (a history of Port Hope's nuclear industry up to 1975). Tom began his activism during the Crazy Caverns campaign and initiated the Citizens' Coalition that finally defeated the scheme. The couple celebrate 50 years of marriage in the next few months - many congratulations to you both!



SOUTH AFRICA'S PBMR NIGHTMARE CONTINUES

The move to increase nuclear power within South Africa with Eskom's proposals to build a Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) demonstration plant at Koeberg, near Cape Town would lead to the export of over 200 of these reactors and to at least another 10 being built around South Africa.

(639.5737) Earthlife Africa - But still, it is difficult to see how Eskom projections can be met by a supply technology that is yet to get off the drawing board, that does not have necessary government legal approvals and that is *still* desperately seeking investors.

Earthlife Africa (ELA) took the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism to court in January over the decision to approve the PBMR Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and won. (See *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* 623.5663 "Earthlife victory on PBMR EIA") The court agreed that the EIA process was fatally flawed and the decision was overturned. The draft EIA that was circulated for comment was substantially different to the final EIA on which the decision was made and the submissions made by appellants were not even read by the decision maker.

Since the court ruling Eskom has taken a decision to increase the output of the Demonstration Plant from 302 to 400MW (thermal). This will result in changes to the proposed layout and fuel requirements amongst other things.

This cannot be dealt with in an addendum to the previous EIA report and a new application by Eskom was submitted on August 29 and a new EIA process with the normal scoping and EIA phases will now be followed. Interested and Affected Parties will have another opportunity to participate and comment on the PBMR and then the department will make a new decision. However, the consultants used in the first flawed EIA process are being used again the second time around, just under a different name!

(Formally Afrosearch now Mawatsan) ELA will be part of this process performing their watchdog role to ensure that the process is followed correctly and that sufficient information is provided to ensure that meaningful participation is possible.

Eskom provided insufficient information, including on issues of safety and economics, thus no meaningful participation was possible in the previous EIA. Despite ELA requests, Eskom refused to supply the information on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. Earthlife Africa took Eskom to court in August in an attempt to gain access under the Access to Information Act but the judgement has not yet been made. However, during this case Earthlife received some information from Eskom, which Eskom claimed contained trade secrets and was given by mistake. Eskom got an Interdict against Earthlife Africa preventing them from publishing, disseminating or otherwise dealing with the information received in a desperate attempt to undo their mistake. (See also *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* 634.5715 "South Africa: Earthlife gagged for Eskom blunder")

ELA believes that it is vital that this information is made available to government and that it is in the public's interest to know what the documents contain but now cannot reveal the contents because of the apartheid-style decree silencing it.

The PBMR project is officially ten years behind schedule, with the demonstration plant expected to be completed by 2013, and costs are escalating alarmingly. R2 billion (around

US\$315 million) has already been spent and it is expected to cost another R12 billion (nearly US\$1.9 billion) to complete. No orders have been placed and no foreign investors have been found. Parliament recently approved the expenditure of an additional R580 million (around US\$91.5 million) on the PBMR even though the EIA has yet to be approved. PBMR Company is continuing to secure contracts with overseas companies even though the EIA process has not yet been completed nor the licence for the plant issued.

The Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism commissioned a feasibility study by an International Panel of Experts on the PBMR in 2002, which has not yet been published.

The Legal Resource Centre has commissioned an economic study on the PBMR by Steve Thomas, one of the International Panel of Experts and a senior research fellow at the University of Greenwich. The paper has been peer reviewed by the ex-US Nuclear Regulatory Commissioner, who has supported his conclusions.

His conclusion is that the project is financially risky and entails a significant risk of waste of a substantial amount of public money. Further expenditure needs to be carefully and independently appraised to prevent wasting money on a costly white elephant that is already costing 12 times more than originally stated to Parliament.

Source and contact: Olivia Andrews at Earthlife Africa, Cape Town, olivia@earthlife-ct.org.za

EUROPE'S SCANDALOUS NUCLEAR WASTE EXPORTS TO RUSSIA EXPOSED

The Russian freighter, Kapitan Kuroptev, arrived in St. Petersburg with its cargo of some 450 tonnes of radioactive uranium waste on December 7. The cargo vessel was met by Greenpeace activists in inflatables attempting to block its entrance into the port at St. Petersburg. The protestors were eventually forced to abandon their action after being repelled by the ship's crew wielding water hoses - the water froze rapidly in the subzero temperatures.

Greenpeace had already tried to stop the vessel leaving the French port of La Havre when activists there occupied loading cranes in efforts to stop the waste from the Pierrelatte uranium enrichment plant in the Rhone Valley being loaded. Both protests are to highlight the 30-year practice of illegally transporting and dumping nuclear wastes produced in Europe to Russia. Some of Europe's largest energy companies, like EDF, EoN and Vattenfall, are guilty of large scale dumping of radioactive waste while trying to portray the industry as clean and climate friendly.


A new report, "Europe's Radioactive Secret", by the environmental group details the illegal trade that sees contaminated uranium from reprocessing activities at La Hague and depleted uranium from nuclear fuel enrichment facilities in France and Urenco facilities in Gronau (Germany),

Almelo (Netherlands) and Capenhurst (UK) being transported to illegal dumps in Russia. The containers used to transport the wastes do not even meet IAEA standards and pose a serious risk during transportation (over 3,000 kilometres by rail to Siberia) and when eventually dumped. A large percentage of the waste is in the form of hexafluoride crystals that can react violently with water leading to the dispersal of a toxic gas that can prove fatal when inhaled. Greenpeace has collected evidence of 100,000 tonnes of waste being shipped to Russia in the last ten years alone.

Greenpeace in Russia has filed a case against the government export company, Tecksnabexport with the Moscow district court because according to article 48 of the federal law of 2001 "On Environmental Protection", the import of nuclear wastes and foreign nuclear materials to the Russian Federation for the purpose of storage or disposal is prohibited.

The organization has also written to the IAEA's Director-General Dr. Elbaradei to request that he and the agency desist from promoting Russia as a multilateral waste dump.

Source: Greenpeace press releases, December 1 & 8, 2005



IN BRIEF

Cogema guilty! France's highest appeals court, the Court for Annulment has confirmed that Cogema was indeed guilty of illegally importing and storing Australian nuclear waste for the last four years. The regional Court of Appeal in Caen had already come to that conclusion in April but Cogema had appealed. Greenpeace and Cogema have been locked in battle over this issue since March 2001 and on December 7 the Court of Annulment finally closed the case by agreeing with the Court of Appeal decision that **spent nuclear fuel is in fact radioactive nuclear waste** and not an "intermediate-stage product" as Cogema had argued. The decision is expected to open the floodgates for further challenges on the issue of nuclear waste and casts doubt on the fate of all nuclear waste stored by Areva. Well done to all concerned!

Platts Nuclear News Flashes and Greenpeace by e-mail, December 7, 2005; Greenpeace press release, April 12, 2005

60-year extension for aged plant? India's first nuclear power plant, the Tarapur Atomic Power Station (TAPS) could be kept in operation for another 60 years according to a senior official at the plant. Reports have appeared in the media suggesting that the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) and the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd, which operates all NPPs in India, favour extending the lifetime of the plant way beyond that specified by its designers.

Mumbai Mirror, December 8, 2005

Japan's 54th nuclear reactor. The Higashidori plant, a 1,100-megawatt boiling water reactor, has become the first commercial reactor to open in Aomori Prefecture, Japan. Aomori is already home to a reprocessing plant and a high-level waste storage facility. The plant started operation on December 8 and brings the number of nuclear plants in Japan to 54.

www.japantoday.com, December 8, 2005

Mihama No. 3 restarting. Kansai Electric Power Co. has received permission from Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency to restart the Mihama No. 3 reactor nearly a year and a half after a fatal accident at the unit. The No. 3 unit will be the last of Kansai's reactors to restart after the government ordered all eleven of the company's reactors to be shut down for inspections following the deaths of five workers at Mihama in August 2004. (See also *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* 615.5635 "Mihama, Japan: Tracking down the truth")

www.Bloomberg.com, December 6, 2005

US report calls on Israel to disarm. A report commissioned and partly funded by the Pentagon has stated that Israel would need to begin nuclear disarmament in order for Iran's nuclear development to be contained and a nuclear arms race in the region avoided. "Getting Ready for a Nuclear Ready Iran" published by the US Army War College argues that military and diplomatic tactics cannot stop Iran's nuclear development and recommends that the US government persuades Israel to mothball its Dimona nuclear reactor and agree to international monitoring by the IAEA. The full report is available at www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/files/PUB629.pdf

Arab News, November 28, 2005

Greens delay Belene. In Bulgaria environmental groups and the Greens have been successful in their latest attempt to challenge the government on its plans for the Belene nuclear power plant. The Supreme Administrative Court agreed that the tender process for the plant should be delayed since the government approval for the construction was based on an environmental impact assessment that is still being challenged.

www.neimagazine.com, November 23, 2005

Bulgaria wants more decommissioning funds. Bulgaria is seeking an additional 280 million Euro from the European Commission for closing four reactors at Kozlodui nuclear power plant early. To date, Bulgaria has already received 550 million Euros for work towards the shutdown of the reactors.

Sofia Echo, November 25, 2005

KEDO project scrapped. The Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) has finally decided to scrap the 1994 project pledged by the U.S. to North Korea that would have seen two light-water nuclear reactors built in the country. The 1994 U.S.-North Korea nuclear agreement has been suspended since October 2002 when the U.S. said that North Korea had admitted to running an illicit uranium enrichment program.

Kyodo News, November 23, 2005

Activists arrested at Borssele, NL. Eleven Greenpeace activists were arrested after breaking into the grounds of the Borssele nuclear power plant to protest against plans to extend the plants lifetime and to demonstrate how lax security is at the plant. The

Dutch government is expected to discuss the matter keeping Borssele open until 2033 in the coming weeks with a final decision to be made early next year.

AFP, November 23, 2005

U.S. wants new nuclear bombs. U.S. nuclear weapons labs are drawing up plans for new nuclear bombs to replace the ageing arsenal - which incidentally should be destroyed (and not replaced) according to some bothersome treaty or other...

www.npr.org, November 17, 2005

Mugabe to go nuclear? Zimbabwe's President Robert Mugabe has told state radio of a recently discovered uranium deposit that will eventually be exploited and used to generate electricity. Experts have questioned whether the deposits are large enough to support a viable mine and where Mugabe would find the financial and technical expertise to build a nuclear reactor. Zimbabwe is known to have close ties to both North Korea and Iran.

The Sydney Morning Herald, November 22, 2005

Waste transport opposed. German activists were arrested after demonstrating on the track and delaying a train transporting nuclear waste from the La Hague reprocessing facility in France to the Gorleben storage depot in northern Germany. Farmer's tractors were also confiscated after they formed a barricade along the route. Some 15,000 police (equipped with water cannons and tear gas) are guarding the nuclear waste transfer - no doubt at the expense of the taxpayer - from over 3,000 peaceful protestors

The Independent, November 22, 2005; Reuters, November 21, 2005

WISE/NIRS offices and relays

WISE Amsterdam

P.O. Box 59636
1040 LC Amsterdam
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 20 612 6368
Fax: +31 20 689 2179
Email: wiseamster@antenna.nl
Web: www.antenna.nl/wise

NIRS

1424 16th Street NW, #404
Washington, DC 20036
USA
Tel: +1 202 328 0002
Fax: +1 202 462 2183
Email: nirsnet@nirs.org
Web: www.nirs.org

NIRS Southeast

P.O. Box 7586
Asheville, NC 28802
USA
Tel: +1 828 675 1792
Email: nirs@main.nc.us

WISE Argentina

c/o Taller Ecologista
CC 441
2000 Rosario
Argentina
Email: wiseros@ciudad.com.ar
Web: www.taller.org.ar

WISE Austria

c/o Plattform gegen Atomgefahr
Mathilde Halla
Landstrasse 31
4020 Linz
Austria
Tel: +43 732 774275; +43 664 2416806
Fax: +43 732 785602

Email: post@atomstopp.at
Web: www.atomstopp.com

WISE Czech Republic

c/o Jan Beranek
Chytalky 24
594 55 Dolni Loucky
Czech Republic
Tel: +420 604 207305
Email: wisebrno@ecm.cz
Web: www.wisebrno.cz

WISE India

c/o SACCER
42/27 Esankai Mani Veethy
Prakkai Road Jn.
Nagercoil 629 002, Tamil Nadu
India
Tel: +91 4652 240657 / 253295
Email: drspudayakumar@yahoo.com;
spuk@vsnl.net

WISE Japan

P.O. Box 1, Konan Post Office
Hiroshima City 739-1491
Japan

WISE Russia

P.O. Box 1477
236000 Kaliningrad
Russia
Tel/fax: +7 95 2784642
Email: ecodefense@online.ru
Web: www.antiatom.ru

WISE Slovakia

c/o SZOPK Sirius
Katarina Bartovicova
Godrova 3/b
811 06 Bratislava
Slovak Republic
Tel: +421 905 935353

Email: wise@wise.sk
Web: www.wise.sk

WISE South Africa

c/o Earthlife Africa Cape Town
Liz Mc Daid
P.O. Box 176
Observatory, 7935
Cape Town
Tel: +27-21-683-5182
Email: liziwe@mweb.co.za
Web: www.earthlife-ct.org.za

WISE Sweden

c/o FMKK
Barnängsgatan 23
116 41 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel: +46 8 84 1490
Fax: +46 8 84 5181
Email: info@folkampanjen.se
Web: www.folkampanjen.se
c/o FMKK

WISE Ukraine

P.O. Box 73
Rivne-33023
Ukraine
Tel/fax: +380 362 237024
Email: ecoclub@ukrwest.net
Web: www.atominfo.org.ua

WISE Uranium

Peter Diehl
Am Schwedenteich 4
01477 Arnsdorf
Germany
Tel: +49 35200 20737
Email: uranium@t-online.de
Web: www.wise-uranium.org

WISE/NIRS NUCLEAR MONITOR

The Nuclear Information & Resource Service was founded in 1978 and is based in Washington, US. The World Information Service on Energy was set up in the same year and houses in Amsterdam, Netherlands. NIRS and WISE Amsterdam joined forces in 2000, creating a worldwide network of information and resource centers for citizens and environmental organizations concerned about nuclear power, radioactive waste, radiation, and sustainable energy issues.

The *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* publishes international information in English 20 times a year. A Spanish translation of this newsletter is available on the WISE Amsterdam website (www.antenna.nl/wise/esp). A Russian version is published by WISE Russia and a Ukrainian version is published by WISE Ukraine. The *WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor* can be obtained both on paper and in an email version (pdf format). Old issues are (after two months) available through the WISE Amsterdam homepage: www.antenna.nl/wise.

Receiving the WISE/NIRS Nuclear Monitor

US and Canada based readers should contact NIRS for details of how to receive the *Nuclear Monitor* (address see page 11). Others receive the *Nuclear Monitor* through WISE Amsterdam. For individuals and NGOs we ask a minimum annual donation of 50 Euros (20 Euros for the email version). Institutions and industry should contact us for details of subscription prices.

WISE/NIRS NUCLEAR MONITOR

c/o WISE Amsterdam
PO Box 59636
1040 LC Amsterdam
Netherlands

**PRINTED MATTER
MATERIE IMPRIMEE**

