

EDITORIAL STAFF**Editor-in-Chief**

Laurence Hecht

Managing Editor

Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Associate Editors

Elijah C. Boyd

David Cherry

Christine Craig

Marsha Freeman

Colin M. Lowry

Gregory B. Murphy

Richard Sanders

Charles B. Stevens

Books

David Cherry

Art Director

Alan Yue

Advertising Manager

Marsha Freeman

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Francesco Celani, Ph.D.

Hugh W. Ellsaesser, Ph.D.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Wolfgang Lillge, M.D.

Ramtanu Maitra

Thomas E. Phipps, Jr., Ph.D.

B.A. Soldano, Ph.D.

21st Century Science & Technology

(ISSN 0895-6820) is published 4 times a year by 21st Century Science Associates, 60 Sycolin Road, Suite 203, Leesburg, Va. 20175. Tel. (703) 777-6943.

Address all correspondence to **21st Century**, P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041.

21st Century is dedicated to the promotion of unending scientific progress, all directed to serve the proper common aims of mankind.

Opinions expressed in articles are not necessarily those of 21st Century Science Associates or the scientific advisory board.

We are not responsible for unsolicited manuscripts.

Electronic subscriptions are \$25 for 6 issues or \$48 for 12 issues. Back issues (1988-2005) are \$5 each (\$8 foreign). Electronic issues from 2006 on are \$5 each. Payments must be in U.S. currency.

Copyright © 2011

21st Century Science Associates**ISSN 0895-682****www.21stcenturysciencetech.com**

The 'Big Lie' About Radiation and LNT

Well-known toxicologist Dr. Edward Calabrese* made the startling discovery recently that the Linear No-Threshold (LNT) hypothesis, which governs radiation and chemical protection today, was based on a deliberate lie, proclaimed in 1946 by Nobel Laureate Hermann Muller for political reasons.

The LNT assumes that the known deleterious effects of very high dose levels can be extrapolated linearly down to a zero dose. Another way this has been put is that there is no safe dose of radiation. As most of our readers know only too well, the reigning LNT hypothesis is responsible for generations of fear of radiation in the population, the major factor in killing nuclear power and the enormous economic benefits it brings. On a world scale, the cost of not going nuclear can be measured in millions of lives lost, and millions more left to lead a life of misery. Meanwhile, billions of dollars are spent protecting society against the non-existing dangers of low-dose radiation.

Although the overwhelming experimental evidence that dose-response in radiation is *non-linear* has been known for decades, as have the health benefits of low-dose radiation, Dr. Calabrese's uncovering of Muller's "Big Lie" is totally new.

* Dr. Calabrese is Professor in the Environmental Health Sciences Division at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. As a toxicology specialist, he has written scores of articles about the non-linearity of dose-response, including the benefits of low-dose radiation (called hormesis). He is founder and chairman of the advisory committee of BELLE, the Biological Effects of Low Level Exposure, a group founded in 1990, which includes scientists from several disciplines and aims to encourage assessment of the biological effects of low level exposures to chemical agents and radioactivity.

In brief, the story is that well-respected geneticist Hermann Muller (1890-1967) lied outright in accepting his Nobel Prize in 1946, when he stated flatly about radiation effects that there is "no escape from the conclusion that there is no threshold." Dr. Calabrese was able to document that Muller knew this statement was not true, and that he was intimately familiar with the competent research that contradicted his statement. He unearthed from the archives correspondence between Muller and co-workers that show without a doubt that Muller not only knew of the research results that showed a threshold, but that Muller et al. contrived to make those threshold results "disappear" from the scientific literature.

The full story will appear in our next issue, in an in-depth interview with Dr. Calabrese, to be posted on the *21st Century* website in advance.

Top-down Scientific Fraud

The perpetuation of a fraud this momentous deserves to be fully scrutinized as to motive. Some will point to the economic motive: The nuclear and medical establishments have a lot invested in the LNT, from the labyrinth of regulations regarding nuclear safety, to the legions of clean-up operations that are making the grounds of former nuclear sites edible in purity, to the exclusion of low-level radiation in treating diseases like gangrene and cancer in favor of less-effective chemotherapies.

But, as in most large-scale scientific fraud, the motivation is not merely economic, but ideological. The aim of those promoting the antinuclear movement, such as Britain's Prince Philip and his fellow Malthusian Maurice Strong, is to drastically reduce the world's population, from its present 6.97 billion to be-

low 1 billion persons. Like the mythical story of the Olympian Zeus, who punished Prometheus for bringing the common man knowledge of fire (technology), the “Big Lie” about radiation is intended to prevent mankind’s full use of nuclear fission.

Muller was not simply a leading geneticist. He was a protégé of the eugenicist Malthusian Julian Huxley, and he worked with the genocide advocate Bertrand Russell in the Pugwash “ban the bomb” movement. Muller’s argument was that population quantity and quality needed to be planned, which could be accomplished by undoing the yoke between “personal love” and reproduction. As he explains in his 1935 book, *Out of the Night*, “The physical means for this emancipation are now known for the first time in history.”

In his 1935 book, Muller argues the case for saving the sperm of “our greatest living men” in order to inseminate women of childbearing age. In this way, he wrote, “we should be able to raise virtually all mankind to or beyond levels heretofore attained only by the most remarkable gifted.” Muller says that this would of course take “a century or two,” for it would be “voluntary”—families could have “natural” children as well as sperm bank children, so the transition to an all-genius society would be slow.

“Now all this is no idle dream,” Muller wrote. “It not only certainly can be done—I believe it certainly will be done... Not only is our genetic improvement patently possible, but it is far surer and more feasible than any ultimate conquest of the atom, of interplanetary space, or of external nature in general....”

There is clearly more to be uncovered in Muller’s philosophy and political activities. But the fact remains that he deliberately lied to steer radiation policy into the realm of fear, instead of science. The question is, why is a fraud this enormous not making headlines? Why is there no clamor for a review of the LNT-based standards?

Until scientists and the public act to bring science back to radiation policy, society will continue to pay for Muller’s “big lie” in lost lives and a lost future for the human species.

—Marjorie Mazel Hecht



Cosmic Causes of Weather

To the Editor:

I found your article titled “Saturn’s Storm, Earth’s Unrest, Science’s Silence” [Editorial, Spring 2011] intriguing, as I recently have been curiously researching the potential cosmic causes of the increased global weather phenomena, earthquake, and volcanic activity. Your editorial suggests the role of the Sun’s solar activity as one key element. However, I found that the current solar cycle has been considerably less active than previous cycles especially over the last three years when its activity was to have peaked. Based on this unusual decline I looked at other potential causes such as the jet stream and ocean currents.

I learned that the ocean currents influence the jet stream patterns, and while the last decade has actually been cooler than the previous decade, the oceans temperature has actually risen by 2 degrees Celsius over the past 20 years. It was noted that the increase in the ocean’s water temperature is not due to atmospheric warming but to the hyper volcanic activity on the ocean’s floor, estimated at over 5,000 spewing lava and greenhouse gases.

Due to rising ocean temperatures, the jet stream’s patterns have been influenced to cause the abnormal global weather activity (drought and flooding) and the storm strength of hurricanes and tornados. Could this increased tectonic activity be the early indications of the potential for an ELE (extinction level event), as you discretely mentioned in your editorial?

Recently Lyndon LaRouche commented in an interview that the world would be experiencing a significant increase in nature’s catastrophes, but he did not elaborate. Is he in agreement with your conclusion of this article or does the *EIR* staff have other relative cosmic information regarding nature’s phenomena that you have determined too explosive for the general public to grasp? In other

words, do your publications have an emergency preparedness plan in place, and if so please explain?

Steve Torrez
Houston, Tex.

The Editor Replies

There is no hidden agenda or preparedness plan. We have called for full funding for the “eyes and ears” in space, so that we may have the best possible knowledge of present and future threats. We have called for the kind of preparedness plans that should be standard for earthquakes—reinforced buildings, an adequately funded program for warning systems, and good evacuation plans. NAWAPA would provide protection from floods, drought, etc. by its vast improvement on water management, and the changes in weather patterns that these new distributions of water will produce.

There is no simple relationship of earthquakes and volcanoes to the solar cycle; however, solar and galactic influences are present and their causative mechanism must be sought out and better understood. There is some new evidence of a correlations of earthquake activity with the solar minima. Although we are experiencing a weak solar cycle, some very large solar flares have occurred. We have also recently discovered that flare intensity has to be measured over a longer period of time to find the true integrated effect.

The larger point to think about is: What changes in the galaxy influence the behavior of the Sun and such phenomenon as the Saturn storm? Rather than take a statistical approach to solar cycles, ask what larger process are they a part of.

You might find the book by Pulinetz and Boyarchuk, *Ionic Precursors of Earthquakes*, helpful in thinking about various ways that atmospheric changes might influence or signal tectonic activity. Weather is also influenced by solar and cosmic radiation. In another highly recommended book, *Sun, Weather, and Climate* by Hermann and Goldberg, it is noted that a single cosmic ray of very high intensity, perhaps 10^{18} eV could trigger an Atlantic storm.

Best of luck in your researches.