RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTRE "KURCHATOV INSTITUTE"

RRC KI, Kurchatov Sq., Moscow 123182, Russia



Executive Vice-Chairman

Japan Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc

Fax: 81-3-5777-0760

Subject: Japanese visit to Russian Far East



グラ 後 1年からレコゼーイを 「ベリキコを本了

先日の年後かかれてかり

Dear Dr. Mori,

In charge of acad. Velikhov I ask you to take our deep gratitude for your letter of August 29.

I'd like to notice once more that this additional information perhaps will be needed for visit permission receiving from General Staff.

Yours

Vyacheslav Kuznetsov

Head of Operation Department

attached to President

RRC "Kurchatov Institute"

Subject: Recommendations French Academy of Medicine

Date: Sun, 19 Oct 2003 16:29:53 +0200
From: Michel Lung <mlung@club-internet.fr>
To: Kazuhisa MORI <kito@jaif.or.jp>

CC: Jean-jacques LAVIGNE (jjl@pnsnet.co.jp)

Dear Mr Mori,

I thought that you may be interested by this recent recommendation from the French Academy of Medicine in the field of Energy, which advocates use of nuclear energy as one of the best means compatible with health of the populations.

With my best personal regards,

Michel Lung



Name: RecommandAcadMedecine7.03.doc

Type: Microsoft Word Document (application/msword)

Encoding: base64

Recommendations of the French Academy of Medicine In terms of Health and Energy choices

It is worth noting recommendations made by the *French National Academy of Medicine* in terms of Health and Energy choices (adopted in plenary session, July 1st, 2003). *Quote*:

- 1. Priority must be given to insure continuity in power delivery. As a matter of fact, the highest risk for health is lack of energy, as it appears at different degrees from the following:
 - a. the relationship between sanitary level and energy consumption in developing countries,
 - b. the importance of keeping continuity in the cold chain and in fighting against the effects of extreme temperatures,
 - c. the sanitary consequences of breaks in power distribution as recently happened in some countries.

Price of energy must be kept reasonably low to avoid rationing through high prices and to protect the lower classes of population.

- 2. Maintain the nuclear power option, inasmuch as it appears that it has the lowest impact on health in terms of kWh produced, compared to use of fossil fuels, biomass, waste incineration and even, following in particular the EU ExternE Study, compared to wind and photovoltaic energy (due to their cycle life). The Academy in due time will give their opinion on the solutions which will be selected (*i.e.* in France) for disposal of long-term, high active nuclear waste.
- 3. Encourage important research efforts in the field of the mechanisms and evaluation of the health effects of low doses, whether they are caused by chemical toxic compounds or by radioactive ones. The Academy recalls that the estimation of the consequences for health of low levels of irradiation (i.e. lower than some mSv) or of low concentrations of carcinogenic materials, using a linear no-threshold relation, has no scientific justification.
- 4. Pursue the Industry and Research efforts, successfully launched for the last 20 years, to reduce the pollution due to transports

and industrial and domestic waste. Point out the chemical substances which are most involved, follow them systematically in surveying air quality in- and outdoors. Promote the means which tend to reduce them.

5. Pay attention to the risks to health caused by climate changes and increase of greenhouse gases level in the atmosphere. This level increase continues in the developed countries and will be enhanced by the industrialization of developing countries which will inevitably turn to fossil fuels if no assistance of the richer countries is provided.

Unquote.