

- - - - -

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING

Afternoon Session

Before Gina L. Smith, Certified Court Reporter

At the North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, South Carolina

On Thursday, February 21, 2008

- - - - -

AUGUSTA WEST/CULPEPPER REPORTING
Certified Court Reporters
505 Courthouse Lane
Augusta, Georgia 30901
(706) 722-3746 or (706) 863-3918
1-800-592-3376 (Depo)

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Good afternoon. I want to thank you all for taking the time to participate in this important public hearing on the National Nuclear Security Administration's Supplementary Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or the Supplemental PEIS for the transformation of the nation's nuclear weapons complex. I hope you've have an opportunity to browse the displays off to my right here and talk to project staff during the just-completed open house. If not, there will be other opportunity before you leave.

My name is Barry Lawson and I am the moderator for this hearing. My roles this afternoon and tonight are to ensure that there are opportunities for those of you attending the hearing to obtain information about the proposed program and to provide your comments, and, two, to ensure that everyone observes a few basic ground rules intended to provide for fair and respectful participation by all. As you signed in at the registration table you should have received a participant's packet which contains information on the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex. Now, there are two parts to this hearing. The informal segment began with the open house and continues after

my remarks with a brief welcome video from Mr. Robert Smollen, who is the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, and then a 20-minute presentation by Ted Wyka, the Supplemental PEIS document manager. Mr. Wyka will discuss the Complex Transformation project and the contents of the Supplemental PEIS. The formal segment will begin following Mr. Wyka's presentation. And during that formal segment members of the public will be called to make oral comments on the Supplemental PEIS. The court reporter will then begin making a verbatim record of your comments. There will be no exchange of questions and answers during that session.

The NNSA officials will be here to listen to your comments but will not be engaging in dialogue. Now, if you wish to make an oral comment during the formal comment segment you will need to have signed up at the registration table if you haven't before. I will be recognizing speakers as their names appear on the registration list that will be provided to me. The ground rules for speakers, which is available also at that desk, provides additional information on the--on your providing of those comments. In the formal session, members of the public will be allotted up to 3 minutes each to make their comments. Let me just say a word about the time limit. I have the discretion of

how much time I'd like to allot to each person. I always would love to be able to give people at least 5 minutes. We have at last count well over sixty people who would like to speak. That would be 5 hours of testimony if everyone averaged 5 minutes. So I'm going to ask you please to try to keep your comments within 3 minutes. Gold medals to those who can do it in less than 3 minutes. And if you absolutely--absolutely need to have a couple of more minutes please tell me so in advance. But please--I think everybody will appreciate if you can keep your comments concise. If you have a longer written statement please summarize those comments orally and submit the written statement in its entirety to me. If you believe you will need more than the allotted time, as I say, do let me know and if there's any chance that we have a period of time after everyone has had his or her first opportunity to comment if there's additional time if somebody wants to come back we will take it. We are here to take your comments. We're scheduled to stop at three o'clock this afternoon. I can go beyond that if necessary. But I also remind you that there is another hearing session tonight from 6:00 to 10:00 and the program for the evening is the same as it is for today. Well, that's it for the agenda and the hearing format. Are

there any questions on how we're going to proceed?
Okay. Great. I want to thank you in advance for your cooperation in making this a productive and respectful hearing. And I certainly look forward to your participation as well as your comments. And now we will have a 7 or 8-minute presentation by Mr. Smollen and then Ted Wyka will make his presentation. And who's responsible for getting that going?

[Video presentation by Mr. Smollen.]

[Slide presentation by Mr. Wyka.]

MR. LAWSON: I know that's a lot of information and fairly complicated. Hopefully either if you have comments or if you have questions about it you can refer to some of the project staff or perhaps you've had an opportunity to learn more beforehand in the open house. I'm going to move right into the formal part of the hearing at this point. And to do this I ask you your forbearance as I read some comments into the official record.

This portion of our hearing is officially designated as the Savannah River Public Hearing for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Supplemental PEIS for the Complex Transformation Program. This hearing is being held on February 21st, in the North Augusta, South Carolina Community Center. It is being

held to receive comments on the content of the Supplemental PEIS. We are commencing the public comment portion of this hearing at 12:40 and are scheduled to adjourn once all participants have had a chance to make their comments. Each speaker will have a maximum of 3 minutes and we'll begin with elected state or federal officials. This hearing was preceded by a presentation by NNSA's PEIS document manager, Mr. Ted Wyka. Mr. Wyka will also represent the NNSA in listening to and accepting your oral comments. For the record, my name is Barry Lawson. I've been asked by the NNSA to conduct this comment period as an independent and neutral moderator. I will ensure that the ground rules reviewed earlier in the day are followed. The court reporter today is Gina Smith. Ms. Smith's task is to create a complete and accurate transcription of this hearing. The verbatim transcript of all comments received today will be included in the Administration's record of these proceedings. They will place copies of the transcript from this and other public hearings in the Freedom of Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as practicable. If you wish to make oral comments you must first have signed up at the registration table. I will recognize speakers in the order in which they are registered, as

I said, allowing elected state and federal officials, if any, to go first.

Now, very importantly, please remain in this room if you are scheduled to speak. I will be calling three speakers at a time, the current and the next two, so that you will have some warning before you are to speak. I would ask you if--once you hear your name and you're on deck, if you could move to one of the seats in the front of the room so that we use as little time in getting people up and back to the podium that will make additional time for all speakers. When it is time for you to speak if you would come to this podium over here to my left, this will help the court reporter to make an accurate record of your comments. Please remember the time limit and the fact that this is a hearing on a Supplemental PEIS for the proposed project. If you are approaching the time limit, in other words, 3 minutes, I will ask you to summarize your remaining comments as quickly, yet as gracefully, as possible. I may call for a break or recess in the proceedings to give the court reporter or others a breather if it seems necessary.

Also because getting an official record and getting it accurate is so important I would ask you to remain as quiet in this room as possible. If you find

it necessary to use a phone or to talk to somebody if you could step out into the other room we would all greatly appreciate that. You're also recommended to state your name for the court reporter's record. If you have a written comment or--excuse me, a written copy of your comments or if you have a written document you would also like to submit as an exhibit if you would please bring it to me after you've spoken I'll make sure that it is included in the record. Those will be formally accepted into the record as exhibits in addition to the oral comments and each is weighed equally by NNSA. Bear in mind that you may also submit comments by U.S. Mail, email, fax or telephone anytime until the close of the comment period on April 10th of this year. There is no limitation on the number of length of comments an individual may submit.

Okay. Are we ready to get set, go? Our first speak this afternoon will be Molly Reilly, and she will be followed by Patrick--I think it's Amalone or Amaloney and then Susan Keith. Ms. Reilly.

MS. REILLY: Hi. I'm Molly Reilly and I'm--I'm a school student from Atlanta and I'm here with my mother and my grandmother right over there. And we're here to read a letter that was written by my grandfather, James Laney.

Dear Mr. Wyka: as a former ambassador to South Korea and a long-time observer of the Korean peninsula, I have seen events demonstrated by--demonstrated time and again that dialogue moves conflict towards resolution while threats backed by overwhelming nuclear dominance only halts such--okay. Overwhelming nuclear dominance only halts such movement and heighten tension. The nuclear--the nuclear deterrence policy is increasingly ineffective, that is, the belief that the United States can demand that other countries disarm while we upgrade and invent new nuclear weapons at home is more untenable by the day.

MR. LAWSON: Take your time. Take a deep breath.

MS. REILLY: The falseness of this premise is seen in the fact that four countries have tested nuclear weapons since the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty sought to limit possession to the five original nuclear weapons states. Nuclear expert Hans Blix predicted at least--predicts at least a dozen new nuclear powers over the next 10 years. Unfortunately the lack of widespread awareness and alarm that the world teeters at the nuclear precipice does not make the danger less real. Our only hope rests on the community of nations coming together under the leadership of the United States to work for mutual--for a mutually verifiable

nuclear disarmament. Henry A. Kissinger, Sam Nunn, George P. Schultz, George P. Solj--Schultz, and William J. Perry advocated this route when they wrote in the Wall Street Journal that spread--that spreading of--that spreading the nuclear--that the spread of nuclear weapons and the--and knowhow meant--meant that the deadliest weapons ever invented will fall into dangerous hands. The concept of the Complex Transformation flies in the face of the emerging political consensus that nuclear weapons must be banned altogether. The new plan sends the message that the United States is committed to revamping and updating, not reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons. While there is yet time let us lead the way to--let us lead the way to a world finally free of nuclear menace. Jim Laney.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Patrick Amalone or Amaloney to be followed by Susan Keith and Bobbie Paul.

MR. AMALONE: I've been involved in the nuclear weapons process for about 40 years. I've been around nuclear materials. I was sitting at my chair thinking I wonder how many people in here have had a Geiger counter in their hand. How many have had a film badge

in your--in your pocket. How about a dosimeter? Do those make you feel comfortable when you have them? I remember going out to a--I was a nondestructive testing radiographer. That meant that I used radioisotopes to probe the insides of wells for impurities. I remember going to a site with a 100-curie source. Did anybody here have one of those? Do you know what that feels like, 100 curies? That means that if I had that in my hand you wouldn't be safe for ten blocks. And there I am 15 feet from it. We have learned so much about gamma radiation. We've learned so much about nuclear weapons. The thing I think we've learned most is--well, let's just stop making them. I'm from the Rocky Flats Truth Force. I helped them with many of their security measurements when I got arrested there ten times. We showed them how easy it was for someone to drive into these facilities showing nothing more than a driver's license. I remember one of my most poignant questions of the facility managers is are these facilities capable of withstanding a nuclear weapon. Well, no, of course not. Are they capable of withstanding a regular high explosives? Oh, of course not. So how many of these facilities are we going to make, new facilities, that are going to be terrorist-proof? This is the war that we have right now. We're

not involved in the Cold War anymore. That's history.

We're in the war on terror; right? So why are we building facilities--why are we thinking about building facilities that are going to make us less secure? Are we going to give our children the legacy of letting them walk around with a Geiger counter and a film badge and a dosimeter and make them wonder how much radiation there is on the playground or at the vegetable stand? I think that one of the things that we have learned is that we don't need nuclear weapons. So the best environment for us is to get rid of them. I don't see anything in here that says we've decided to stop making these things; we've decided to take them all apart.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. AMALONE: This is the direction that we really need our environment to go to. Now, I want you to think about a world with no nuclear weapons. That is a deterrent to war because we are on the edge of terrorists. If we make more weapons they are going to end up with these weapons. And you people who work in the industry know that and that scares the crap out of you. These people are going to get 8 pounds of plutonium. What could they do with 8 pounds? What could they do with 50 pounds? What could they do with 500 pounds? The only way we can stop them is to stop

producing these weapons, take them apart and get them out of their hands. I have one quick poem from the nuclear test site in Nevada. Thunder rolling through the sky, thunder rolling through my heart, thunder rolling through the earth, the earth trembling with pain, the earth trembling with shame, the earth trembling with fear, fear for her children, fear for her future, fear for the next thunder rolling. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you sir. Our next speaker is Susan Keith, then Bobbie Paul and Betsey Miklethun.

MS. KEITH: I am Susan Keith and I am a mother of a teenage son. I live in Atlanta and I just wonder--I'm just--it's all coming back to me growing up that I lived in central Florida in the '50s and having to try to get home as fast as I could before the bomb was dropped on us, you know. To this day I carry a little pocketknife and a can opener with me in case I have to survive somewhere in the woods. I don't want my kid to grow up in that kind of world. I don't understand why we're still talking about this. I don't know why we want to make more nuclear weapons and how can we be threatening Iran because they're--they might possibly be thinking about them and we already have more than anybody else in the world. We want to make

more and we're the only country that's ever used them.

Since the PEIS is required to analyze all the impacts of a proposed project the environmental and health issues are a no-brainer because just look at what we did at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I think we can see what the environmental and health impacts are of nuclear weapons. But I would also like you to consider the economic impact of putting all of our tax dollars into making more weapons. We could be using that money for healthcare, education and alternative forms of energy.

I think more nukes will not make us safer. Being good neighbors and good citizens of the global community will. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thanks. The next speaker is Bobbie Paul. She will be followed by Betsey Miklethun and Henry Gurr.

MS. PAUL: Thank you. My name is Bobbie Paul and I'm the director with Atlanta WAND, Women's Action for New Directions. We're the ones that brought the bus over from Atlanta, Georgia, with a variety of concerned citizens along with the Hiroshima/Nagasaki A Bomb exhibit. And we hope you'll visit it in Room B.

Atlanta WAND opposes Complex Transformation. It is a misguided plan being marketed by DOE, in our minds, as a modernization and revitalization of the

U.S. nuclear weapons complex. But when one looks beyond the streamlining and rearrangement of DOE weapons facilities it seems that the real intent of Complex Transformation is revealed. The U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA--got it right--wants to continue what DOE began 60 years ago, building bombs and bomb components. I just want to stop for a minute. I just wonder in this room while we're all together--could I just see through a show of hands or people's--maybe stand up if you are opposed to what we call Bombplex. Thank you. I'm sure there are people who have other--and I honor the other people's presence. Complex Transformation would cost about \$150 billion over time to ultimately create a new generation of new nuclear weapons, a new generation. This plan we call Bombplex. This would strip, in our minds, our nation of self-respect and give our children, the real new generation, reason to despair. It's time for the weapon makers and the politicians they handsomely influence--and as Ted said, are a lot of the people making these policies that we have to enforce--to realize that this is not what the people want. Over thirty--

FEMALE VOICE: Amen.

MS. PAUL: Over 33,000 people spoke out

against--spoke about this. I think over 32,000 comments in November, starting right here on November 9th, when we were here in 2006, said no. Said no when it was first introduced as Complex 2030. Well, here it is back, whether it's old wine in new bottles, streamlined, whatever, the essential components are the same. We can't believe it when we're grappling with the enormous cleanup problems that we have at Savannah River Site, 35 million gallons of high level radioactive waste sitting in forty-nine compromised and leaking tanks in the ground. This is what--this environmental maintenance budget is what is being endangered possibly with something of this magnitude coming in to replace it. It took our breath away. More bombs, we couldn't believe it. We said no then and we say no now. We refuse to sit by quietly and allow our country to break the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty that we signed in 1970 with other nuclear nations, promising to disarm in good time.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MS. PAUL: We long to regain our credibility in the world, not to continue losing it by arrogantly doing something we tell other nations not to even think of doing. How would we--how do we explain this behavior to our children? All right. I will close

with my last paragraph and I'll submit these comments.

As Molly, whose grandmother is on the advisory WAND board, Berta Laney, and her father was ambassador to South Korea, so boldly said, I'd like to reinforce this. The fact that we're developing weapons that we are likely never to use is of no comfort. Spending billions on a massive plan such as Bombplex is immoral when there are so many human and environmental needs that are going unmet in our country. Former cabinet members, George Schultz--hard to say, isn't it, Molly?--William Perry and Henry Kissinger, as well as former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn, have adopted the joint position that we need to champion, quote, the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, unquote, and a, quote, bold initiative consistent with America's moral heritage. We feel a resounding no to Complex Transformation, Bombplex, call it what you will, would be a good start. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. I was just saying that I certainly regret having to cut people off. I know you have--many of you have longer statements. If you do have it written please submit them so that they will have equal weight in the comments that are made to DOE.

Our next speaker will be Betsey Micklethun and then Henry Gurr and Gerald Rudolph.

MS. MIKLETHUN: My name is Betsey Miklethun. I'm here with the Atlanta WAND group today. I want to thank you for letting us speak. I want to say that anything that's decided in this arena or the arenas to come will have an impact upon our environment. And you know that and we all know that. Georgia has a water problem. We're concerned about the water and what's going into it from the Savannah River Site. You look at the map of the site and all these tributaries and obviously they're picking up from the ground whatever is there, and we're concerned. We're concerned about the waste problem that Bobbie mentioned. What's happening to all the containers of used plutonium, uranium and so on? We know that uranium in the body is cumulative. You never get rid of any of it. We know that, for instance, dental x-rays 30 years ago were much, much stronger than they are today. My son, the dentist, says, oh, Mom, you can have x-rays now. They're safe. Well, they weren't then 30 years ago. Is that the conclusion of that? What isn't safe today is my question. What isn't safe that we're putting into our air, our ground and so on? The other thing we're concerned about is global warming. And whenever uranium is mined it--the mining process and the milling

process is--is--uses a tremendous amount of coal and all of this coal puts carbon dioxide into the air which, as you all know, this is one of our main problems today, global warming. So that's another thing to consider. And the cost--the cost is completely prohibitive. If it isn't it should be. I'm--I think you're not going to have to warn me--warn me 'cause I'm almost done. I want to say that my request today would be that you endorse the three Ds. Rather than stockpiling bombs, diplomacy. We haven't seen that used for a long time. The second D is disarmament. Disarmament can make us safe. Arming and building stockpiles of this stuff does not make for safety or security. And three, distribution, distribution of the wealth that we're squandering by putting it into bombs. Distribution to alternative environmental sources, to education, to healthcare, to the things that you and I really need in this country.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Henry Gurr and he will be followed by Gerald Rudolph and Jeannine Honicker.

MR. GURR: My name is Henry Gurr. I'm a professor emeritus at the University of Aiken in South Carolina

and a nuclear physicist who worked for many years with nuclear neutrino research at the Savannah River Plant under the sponsorship of Department of Energy through the University of California research contracts. And we've been hearing today about the--how this reworking of the Bombplex will make a facility more efficient, less costly, with lower environmental impact. Clearly what is--should be on the minds of all of us is that we can reduce the environmental impact. We can make a facility more efficient or less costly by having less nuclear weapons to have to maintain and keep or even construct new ones, as has been talked about. Now, clearly, these same documents tell us that, well, the NNSA is guided by and must follow the--their commandments or their guidelines given to them by the President and Congress. So their hands are held. They will have to keep maintaining this same nuclear structure in order to keep on maintaining nuclear weapons. But now, many times people have said here this morning that the more weapons we have and the more weapons we keep are an invitation to inviting other countries or forcing those countries, even justifying those countries to having more nuclear weapons of their own. Now, and again and again it's said here that, well, it's national security that we're seeking by

having more nuclear weapons and keeping them. Forcing and bringing--justifying other countries to have their own nuclear weapons is going to make us more secure? Accidents happen. Terrorists will get ahold of those weapons. The more that are around, the more likely something is going to happen. And then what kind of a chain of retaliation can come from that and even perhaps nuclear war? So let's cut down environmental impact and let's reduce the nuclear weapons effort. Let's be a moral nation and help the whole world do this. And in order to do so you must contact your congressman, you must contact your senators, send emails and letters to the President. Stop the insanity, slow down our nuclear weapons. That is the way to make us more secure. Now, to add to this, it would just take a fraction of our military money, our nuclear weapons money and let's invest in peace efforts. What makes warfare and what makes this world dangerous to us is hunger and deprivation and disease around the world. We can help other people live a more satisfactory life, so more money for that and that will reduce the danger to us. That will reduce our requirements to have this--the huge complex which does, after all, cause environmental degradation and carbon dioxide emission. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Gerald Rudolph to be followed by Jeannine Honicker and Judy Gordon.

MR. RUDOLPH: Today I'm representing the South Carolina Christian Action Council. The executive minister, Reverend Brenda Lynn Neece, had planned to come and was not able and I'm speaking on her behalf.

The Christian Action Council is made up of sixteen member bodies. These bodies are the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Alliance of Baptist, the Baptist Educational and Missionary Convention, the Christians Church (Disciples of Christ), the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, the Church of the Nazarene, the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship of South Carolina, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the Presbyterian Church of the USA, Reformed Episcopal Church, Religious Society of Friends, the Roman Catholic Church, the Salvation Army, United Methodist Church and the Wesleyan Church. These sixteen member bodies are represented by twenty-one judicatories with nearly four thousand congregations. Individual members of these congregations total approximately 1 million of South Carolina's four million citizens. And I won't read the whole statement. The Christian Action Council is guided by

the teachings of the Bible, the Koran and other sacred texts. And guided by these texts we cannot envision a situation in which we could support the indiscriminate destruction of human life from the use of nuclear weapons. While we come from separate religious traditions we speak with one voice to say that we oppose the construction of a new nuclear weapons complex or the production of any additional nuclear weapons. The production of nuclear weapons brings with it a legacy of health problems and environmental degradation borne in large part by the poorest of the poor. The renewal of the weapons--nuclear weapons complex as described in the Complex 2030 plan would add to the devastation that these communities are already experiencing. The U.S. cannot call on other nations to stop the production of new nuclear weapons while American scientists are spending millions to develop a new generation of deadly nuclear bombs. The U.S. should be working to reduce the stockpile of nuclear weapons, not devastating new ways to spend millions of tax dollars to build new weapons. This was part of a resolution that was adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the South Carolina Christian Action Council in May 17th of 2007. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is

Jeannine Honicker. Ms. Honicker will be followed by Judy Gordon and Judith Stocker.

MS. HONICKER: Thank you. I'm Jeannine Honicker from LaGrange, Georgia, and we have recently organized with a group of the Sierra Club there. I speak on my own behalf but I'm sure that the words that I say reflect the views of not only the sixty-five people that were at our last meeting and the hundred people who had signed up on our email list but probably most of the 1,300,000 Sierra Club members nationwide. First of all, anything that we cannot use is waste. Do you agree with that? How many nuclear bombs do we have on hair-trigger alert right now?

FEMALE VOICE: Six thousand.

MS. HONICKER: Add that to the ten thousand pits that we just heard are in the--at Pantex. Twenty more new pits are now being produced every year. How many can we ever use?

VOICES: None.

MS. HONICKER: So what does that make all of them?

VOICES: Waste.

MS. HONICKER: Waste.

FEMALE VOICE: Nuclear waste.

MS. HONICKER: Do you know what is happening to

the hazardous waste in America right now? It's going into fertilizer. The solution to pollution is still dilution. They think they can put it in fertilizer and spread it over a large area, our lawns, our farmland, and it's all in this book which was a Pulitzer prize nominee by Duff Wilson called *Fateful Harvest*. I recommend that every one of you read this. This is a--an investigative report from the *Seattle Times*. He documents that this is the truth. The government knows about it. EPA knows about it. Why do we allow this to happen? This is nuclear waste. It's hazardous waste from other sources. It includes beryllium. It includes cadmium, arsenic, lead and any number of other things that will kill us. Why do you think that we have had such an increase in attention deficit disorder and all the other children's diseases? It's listed here. The book is called *Fateful Harvest*. I want to give you my suggestion on what to do with these nuclear weapons. We can't use them. We've got to get rid of them. But should we go to the problem--to the process of turning them into liquid, then turning them back into solid when they're already solid? It's easier to dispose of something in a solid form than it is in a liquid form. So I suggest that we use the silos where they are in now, take out the delivery system and, as

somebody said today, just make a cake of them.
Line--make a layer of nuclear weapons and pour in
concrete. Put another layer of nuclear weapons, pour
in the concrete until you just have the silo encased in
concrete. After all, what are they doing with the
tanks here at Savannah River Site? They're trying to
empty them, convert the solid--the liquids back into a
gas and then they're pouring in the concrete. Why not
just pour the concrete on the weapons to start with? I
propose that we all write our congressmen and give them
this idea. And the money that we save we can rebuild
our bridges. We can build windmills instead of weapons
and we can have the energy source that we want that
will truly be renewable and safe. And let's put solar
collectors on all of our municipal buildings to start
with and on all of our schools and on all of our public
housing projects. In LaGrange we're going to offer
this solution to our mayor on March the 6th, which is
our next Sierra Club meeting and you are all invited.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MS. HONICKER: All right. So we are also
proposing that this be a nano-solar power sheet area
because this is supposed to be one tenth the cost of
conventional photovoltaics. The only place that this
is produced right now is in San Jose, California. They

have shipped a fresh shipment out to Germany but--and they've got a huge backlog. So we also propose and are planning to propose to our mayor that we have a production facility for nano-solar power sheets built in LaGrange. And this is going to be our cool cities recommendation. There are already 794 cool cities in America. I beg you to please take this idea to every one of these cool cities and if your city is not a cool city, make it one. You can go to [www.coolcities dot--I don't know what. But, anyway, find it. Go to coolcities USA and you'll find it. And get on board the solar bandwagon and get off the nuclear bandwagon. We don't want one more nuclear bomb and we want to get rid of them and as soon as possible because this is going to cause us more insecurity and we just cannot afford a nuclear war because the whole human race survival depends on it. Thank you.](http://www.coolcities.com)

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Judy Gordon to be followed by Judith Stocker and Tom Ferguson.

MS. GORDON: I want to bring up a subject that you haven't heard much about this afternoon because the people who are going to be talking about it won't be here till this evening when they have the attention of

the local press. And that's the idea that we really need all of this because it means jobs in the surrounding area. I have a point to make and that is this is a national issue. It is not about supporting the local economy. I think that we should be looking--we should be looking at questions that deal with the national aspects. And I would like to enumerate some of these questions. One, will spending more money on revitalizing the nuclear weapons industry give us greater security? Two, how will this affect nuclear proliferation in international treaties? Three, how many weapons and how much money do we need to have security? Are there alternatives--four, for securing a safer world, alternatives that don't involve continuing the nuclear arm race? Five, what government programs will be cut, perhaps never funded, because we're using the money to support the nuclear industry. Six, how will state and federal programs deal with specific environmental issues? And, of course, this is where some of the biggest concerns are for the Sierra Club. Some of these have been mentioned but I want to mention them again because they're important. What are we going to do with all this waste? What's going to happen with the water demands on the Savannah River? We already have some problems. And finally, there are

social issues involved, things like shipping accidents, who is going to take care of all the waste that's being generated--because nobody wants it. What are we going to do about these things? That's what we should be talking about, not what they're going to be talking about this evening for a half hour and that's how great it's going to be to have all these jobs coming into the Savannah River Site. I don't pretend to have the expertise to deal with all these issues. But there are going to be people at these hearings, lawyers, scientists, from the agencies that are not involved with the government. I'm talking about people--scientists from the Union of Concerned Scientists. I'm talking about scientists from the Natural Resources Defense Council who will have expert testimony to offer on how to deal with these questions. Finally I'd like to say that what they have to offer will certainly be more relevant to our national concerns than how many jobs we're going to generate for the local economy. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thanks a lot. The next speaker is Judith Stocker to be followed by Tom Ferguson and Barbara Antonoplos.

MS. STOCKER: Good afternoon. I'm Judy Stocker.

I am the mother of two teenagers. I live in Keysville, which is rock-throwing distance from both Plant Vogtle, which is a nuclear energy facility, and Savannah River Site. And I really have to tell you people I'm scared to death. But what I really would like to know is what is it about this nation that always prioritizes war over people? We're proposing to spend \$150 billion for weapons that we're not going to use. But whenever a bill is submitted for--that would supply adequate healthcare or any other social program it's tabled or done away with because it's too expensive. We can't afford it. \$150 billion would provide total healthcare, cradle-to-grave, for every person in this country forever. You know, we've gutted all our social programs. We've cut spending on education. We've cut spending on everything that improves the quality of life for our citizens because it's too expensive but then blindly propose to spend \$150 billion to build bombs. I don't think we have the right to even consider spending that money when we've got senior citizens in this country who have to make the choice between buying food and buying medicine, when we have overcrowded classrooms because our school systems can't afford to hire enough teachers, when we've got families--every day more and more families falling into

poverty and homelessness. Furthermore, what gives us the right to build weapons when we're demanding that other countries dismantle theirs? We already have enough--we already have enough bombs to destroy this world several times over. We don't need any more bombs. I propose that that \$150 billion be put to a better use. I read a bumper sticker once that said he who dies with the most toys wins. But he who dies with the most toys is still dead. And, in the case of nuclear weapons, so is everybody else.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Tom Ferguson and then Barbara Antonoplos and Wende Ballew.

MR. FERGUSON: I support everybody who's come up here and pointed out that--you know, great positive alternatives to spending this kind of money. There's also the problem of hazardous waste. We don't know what to do with it and now we're going to increase it?

It's also what is going on here is a violation of the Nonproliferation Treaty. But I want to just tell one other story. I went to a trial once in Michigan. There was a--some people that crossed the perimeter of a nuclear facility and were being tried. And one of the arguments they put forth that struck me was if the people of Germany had laid on the tracks to prevent the death trains from going to the death camps they would

have been violating German law. But there's a higher morality than German law. And that's what we face. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you. The next speaker Barbara Antonoplos, Wende Ballew and then Berta Laney.

MS. ANTONOPLOS: I'm Barbara Antonoplos and I'm here from Atlanta, Georgia. I'm speaking not only for myself but for my children, my unborn grandchildren and generations beyond them who deserve to live in a nuclear-free world. Although I am glad to have the opportunity to stand here today and express concerns about Bombplex Transformation, the fact that we are even having to have this discussion at this point in history about a plan to retool our weapons production capability, which will only serve to ratchet up the global threat that the production of nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons components in any country creates renders this moment so absurd that I feel like we should be filming a scene in a Monty Python movie. With apologies to anyone here who actually is British, the scene would include something like, Bless these, thy holy nuclear weapons, that with them thou might blow thine enemies to tiny bits in thy mercy. Really

there's nothing about this that's funny though. We gathered here for the purpose of scrutinizing the scientific nuances of nuclear weapons production. How much toxic tritium in our water is safe? How many birth defects can we tolerate? How much cancer can poor people get before it comes--before it becomes way too obvious a problem? All of which are important things to consider, but beyond that what this moment is screaming for is this. What, are you crazy? This whole enterprise not only is unhealthy, it's insane, irresponsible, immoral and will unquestionably take our country and the rest of the world in exactly the wrong direction. Whew, I needed to do that. I feel like I need to go home and detox from the propaganda load I've gotten today so far, not with the speakers here but the film. Besides considering the toxic impact on our physical environment, we must also consider the toxic effect that this effort will have on the soul and spirit of the world. And in those respects also it gives off nothing but poison. We need to honor our treaties and disarm. We need to leave the world in total and complete nuclear disarmament. We need to clean up the existing toxins and not make more. I understand that in these hearings and, I think, the hearing tonight there will be people here who testify

about the value that this industry brings in terms of jobs. Okay. So if that's the deal, if it's a jobs program for which \$150 billion in taxpayer money are going to be spent, go ahead and take the money. Just pump it into industries that don't kill us and ruin the planet, that don't ooze the death, sorrow and destruction all along the way. I brought this to the podium with me because really when we talk about environmental impact this is pretty much all we need to consider. This is a picture of Nagasaki and Hiroshima after we dropped the bomb on them. Now, do we want more of this? No, we don't want more of this. We must commit ourselves to emphatically saying to our government and to the world no more of this madness ever.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Wende Ballew, then Berta Laney and Krista Brewer.

MS. BALLEW: My name is Wende Ballew. I'm from Atlanta, Georgia. You know, the United States is still held as--or hails itself as a global leader in human--human rights and it's currently recognized as the only superpower in the world. The gentleman before said that we are at a crossroads, and we are. But it's not the crossroads he's talking about. We're at a crossroads of a weakened economy, a weak dollar,

foreign investors buying our corporations. And it's not just individual investors that are doing it. It's countries, countries we consider terrorist--you know, whatever you think of, communist countries, things like that. So how arrogant is it of us to think--we said we're retooling. We're using the linguistics that have become so popular by naming something--putting excellent and--in some--in a proposal's name to make it sound so wonderful. Are these foreign countries that are becoming so rich from our energy use going to believe that it's okay because it's excellent in the name? No. They're going to build bombs. We're starting a new arms race. The last arms race broke--made the Soviet Union bankrupt. It became bankrupt because it was spending all this money on weapons and because it did not have any research and development and did not adapt to its time, not because that communism is intrinsically worse than capitalism. It was because they did not adapt to their times and because they spent too much money on weapons. We are at a--we have a weak economy. We're spending all this money on energy and all these countries that would compete with us in this arms race are collecting those funds. Who will go bankrupt this time, and who will own us when we do?

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Berta Laney and Krista Brewer and Joan King.

MS. LANEY: Thank you. I am Berta Laney and a longtime member of WAND and a mother with five children who are married and sixteen grandchildren. My message today though is about the nuclear problem. Mr. Rajah Ghandi from India came to Atlanta several years ago to--and his message for us at that time was, quote, nuclear war will not mean the death of a hundred million people or even a thousand million. It will mean the extinction of our four thousand million people, the end of life as we know it on our planet now. Earth will be different. Last night we in Atlanta viewed an eclipse of the moon. It was beautiful. And I thought of it as the Earth and life on it. I prayed that our scientists, like you all who are responsible for the nuclear problem, will love our beautiful world and the precious life it contains and honor your God-given talents to eliminate the threatening nuclear bombs and nuclear dangers. May God grant you wisdom to preserve the world and all who live in it. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Krista Brewer and then Joan King and Diann Velentin.

MS. BREWER: Thank you. My name is Krista Brewer and I live in Atlanta, Georgia. I'm a mother of three almost-grown children and I'm a community volunteer. I'm coming here in my role as president of the Atlanta WAND chapter. WAND stands for Women's Action for New Directions. WAND was founded actually as Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament and that has been our major mission. At the end of the Cold War we thought that nuclear weapons were going to be disarmed, that they were going to be a thing of the past. So Atlanta WAND and our national organization, WAND, changed our name to Women's Action for New Directions. We thought we were going to have a new direction in this world. We thought that we were going to have a peace dividend.

The money that we were spending on nuclear weapons could be better spent on human and social needs. Unfortunately and sadly, we're still here working to end nuclear weapons. One thing that I wanted to point out, many of us are bringing a lot of different issues to the forefront, to this podium that are problems with the Complex 2030, Complex Transformation, what we're calling as Bombplex. But I think we need to remember that what it mostly is, however you shift the functions around, it means we're going to start building more nuclear weapons. And is that what we really want for

our country to be doing? There's an estimate that we're--that it has cost--since the beginning of the nuclear weapons industry it's cost probably 6 trillion dollars to build these nuclear weapons. And that's a lot of money that we could have been spending otherwise--in other ways. And I wanted to call on my assistant to kind of give us a better understanding of how many nuclear weapons we really have. This is going to be a representation of how many nuclear weapons the United States actually has. We're going to drop one BB. That's the size of 15 Hiroshima-size bombs. Now 6 BBs. That's enough for four weapons to blow up all of Russia. Now a demonstration of the total U.S. nuclear arsenal. That's 10,000 BBs. That's the equivalent of 150,000 Hiroshima-size bombs. In addition to the cost of constructing these bombs it also costs us 17 billion dollars a year every year to maintain--just to maintain these weapons and their delivery systems. Imagine what we could do with just even the 17.6 billion if we didn't have to maintain and store these nuclear weapons. Better schools, better bridges, safer ports, cleaner air, cleaner water. Just imagine if we didn't have to spend the money on nuclear weapons. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. I'd like to introduce Joan King and then Diann Valentin and Jack Uhrich.

MS. KING: I want to thank you very much for giving us a chance to speak here. I'm Joan King and I came down this morning from Rabun Gap--something wrong here? Is that better? Okay. I'll start all over again. Thank you for giving me this opportunity. I'm Joan King and I came down this morning with a busload of students from Rabun Gap Nacoochee School who are over here. And I'm hoping that maybe one of them will want to speak later on. I'd like to put things in a little bit of time perspective. I was 13 when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. At the time President Truman was told that it would take at least 10 years before the Soviets could catch up. They did it in four. Britain, France and China joined the nuclear club and for a while there was five nuclear armed nations. Now there are nine. And apparently in the next few years we are going to see more. Now, I'm seventy-five now and since my mother lived to be ninety-seven and my doctor says I'm in good health, I could conceivably live for another 20 years. But the world is becoming increasingly unstable. And humanity has already experienced several very close calls with its nuclear arsenal. If in the next 20 years we continue the way we have been going with the nuclear

buildup, international catastrophe is not only possible, it is probably unavoidable. In a single lifetime humanity will have traveled from the first nuclear explosion to worldwide destruction. What are the alternatives? As far as I can see there's only one. We, all of us, have got to start thinking about and working about and putting all our attention on disarmament. Now, I was going to go into the comments about Senator Nunn and some of the other people who have worked on this because they are not naive idealists. They're very sound senior policy people and they believe it is possible. To build more nuclear bombs--and you just had a demonstration here of what we've already got--is like trying to spend your way out of debt. It just can't be done. I respectfully submit that there is a viable alternative to Complex Transformation and it's called nuclear disarmament. And that's the least we can do for our children. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Diann Valentin and then Jack Uhrich and Nick Foster.

MS. VALENTIN: Greetings. I bid you peace and blessings. My name is Diann Valentin and I'm a citizen of the United States of America. I'm a mother and a grandmother. What the Department of Energy is doing

with nuclear weapons is wrong from a moral perspective, a fiscal perspective and an environmental perspective.

It is no longer good enough for you to say that this is my job so if I were not doing it someone else would.

Is it your job to use a reference made of standard criteria that does not consider the most vulnerable, our children, pregnant women, the elderly and those with compromised health when you know that it is wrong just so that you can parade CDC doctors and engineers before us to support certain statistical analyses that support your efforts? You will be looked upon as committing crimes against humanity and you are perpetuating the approaching environmental holocaust. You should have thought of what your--what you needed before you squandered our money on contractors such as Haliburton. You cannot have any more money to put into this dangerous dinosaur. Use the money that you saved from closing the facilities that you speak of. You should be embarrassed and ashamed to use terms like Centers of Excellence relative to nuclear weapons. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jack Uhrich to be followed by Nick Foster and Susan Gamble.

MR. UHRICH: I am not a scientist but I do read and I am old. So I've been following these things for quite a few years. I remember duck-and-cover. How many people here remember duck-and-cover? A few old folks in the room. Okay. How many people here know that when we're being told to duck-and-cover that the--that the Soviet Union didn't yet have an ICBM to deliver anything for us to duck and cover for? Not till '57 or '58. And we were duck-and-covering in '53 and '54. And that means they were scaring the hell out of us over nothing. And they're still doing that. They're fearmongering to the point that we break all records. I am a social worker and I am a therapist. And I'm telling you we break all records on the amount of Prozac we take, the Paxil we take, the people's Prozac we take, otherwise known as marijuana, the legal and illegal drugs, the food we overeat to the point of obesity. That's also known as an addictive disease. And all addictive diseases are actually expressions of an underlying problem with depression and anxiety. And where does that come from, if not from the fearmongering, the holding of nuclear holocaust that they hold over our heads for 50 years. In dollar terms, according to Brookings Institute, stopping in 1996--from 1940 to 1996, we spent 5.48 trillion dollars

just on the nuclear industry. Not on national defense.

For that we spent another 13 trillion dollars. So all totaled they scared us so much into spending 28--almost 29 trillion dollars out of about fourteen--out of about 35 trillion total that we spent over that time. In other words, we spent two thirds of our money on fear.

And the question is when will we stop it? I, too, have children and grandchildren and I don't want them to grow up in a world--and they grew up--are growing up around fear. And I don't want them to worry about tritium in the water, even though I'm told it's safe, even though Dr. Stewart, who's studying the downwinders at Hanford, says this stuff isn't safe, even though Dr. Stewart and Dr. Sternglass and Dr. Goffman have--have released numerous studies indicating that low-level radiation--that there is no safe low-level radiation, that it causes long-term genetic damage. But no one in the government seems to want to follow up on these studies even though they're very alarming studies as the impact of these various radioactive materials on our health. How many people ever heard of immune disease disorder before 1970? Anybody? I hadn't. One--okay. How many immune disease disorders were there before 1970? And yet they're there today. It's not just cancer. It's impacting us on the whole

medical spectrum. And the only way--the other thing about being old is I've been to many of these hearings.

I've been going to hearings since the '80s. And I--whenever anybody is asked how many people here are for this a handful of people stand up. And how many people are against--90 percent of the room stands up. If people were for this don't you think they'd turn out, especially for the jobs? Tonight I'd like for someone to ask that question and say, okay, all those that are for this new spending that are not an elected official, not--don't have a job with the defense industry or aren't a member of a lobbying group for the defense industry stand up. I'd really like to see that. Please stop this insanity. It's time to start spending on our children, on our environment and on our future as long--so long as we have one. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Nick Foster and then Susan Gamble and Martin Fleck.

MR. FOSTER: There's a lot of things I could say today. I could reiterate a lot of what many people have said already. I just wanted to speak something that I felt comes right from my own heart. And it was something that Barbara had said earlier. It's just really more of a question. Why are we still here talking about this? You know, this is such a--it's so

absurd, you know, for all the reasons that everyone has talked about. And that's kind of what I want to ask is--I just--I just want to ask a question. And the thing is I've spent the past 2 to 3 years of my life traveling outside of the United States. And when people ask where I'm from--I'm from LaGrange, Georgia. People ask where I'm from, I tell them Canada. Why?

MR. LAWSON: Susan Gamble? All right. Thank you. Our next speaker then will be Martin Fleck--is Mr. Fleck here--to be followed by Dane Spencer and Gloria Tatum.

MR. FLECK: Thank you. I'm Martin Fleck. I'm the coordinator of the Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Free World. We appreciate that the NNSA is holding hearings so that the public may express opinions on Complex Transformation. And I wanted to suggest that when you're going to be having these hearings all around the nation that you consider weighing disproportionately the opinions of people who have no direct benefit from Complex Transformation spending, which I think is most of the people I've heard so far here today. We're concerned about it because we're citizens. We're not concerned about it because of the spending in Complex

Transformation. The Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Free World is a consortium of sixty-two local, national and international organizations advocating practical steps to eliminate the nuclear threat. We work to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and the pursuit of new warheads and ensure that all existing stockpiles worldwide are multilaterally, verifiably dismantled. The Complex Transformation plan takes a shortsighted approach to our security and assumes that the United States will need to maintain and upgrade nuclear weapons arsenals indefinitely. This is Cold War Thinking from the prior century. We're in a new era now. And for those who may have thought that from what we heard on the video presentation that--you know, the warheads are coming--the arsenals are coming down and we shouldn't be concerned, I want to note that in the President's request for fiscal year 2009 spending there are--there's 30 million dollars in there for the reliable replacement warhead. Keep that in mind. Now, in contrast to Complex Transformation there's momentum building behind a broad bipartisan consensus that it is in the best security interest of the United States to pursue a nuclear weapons free world. That's thinking for this century. Through the 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, as you've heard many times

here already, the United States is committed to implement deeper verifiable and irreversible nuclear weapons reductions. Failure to fulfill these obligations and renounce new warhead production erodes confidence that the nuclear weapons states intend to fulfill their NPT commitments and complicates efforts to repair the beleaguered nonproliferation system. Now, it's very appropriate to be concerned about North Korea and Iran getting the bomb. But as Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency said, it's hard to tell people not to smoke when you have a cigarette hanging out of your mouth. Instead the United States can lead by example.

We call upon the United States; to undertake a comprehensive reexamination of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. security strategy--the last one was in 2001; that was a long time ago--to renounce the development of new nuclear weapons; to ratify the comprehensive test-ban treaty; to achieve dramatically deeper reductions in United States and Russian nuclear and missile stockpiles; and to engage other countries--to lead the effort to engage other countries in negotiations to reach zero nuclear weapons. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Dane

Spencer, then Gloria Tatum and Charles Hughes.

MR. SPENCER: My name is Dane Spencer. I'm from Savannah, Georgia. And I want to start with a poem because these hearings can get a little dry. It's something I wrote. It's pertinent to what we're talking about. I am tritium, wandering this dark world looking for adventure and the American dream. I kill everything but I don't mean to. I have a weird uncle named polonium and a crazy half-sister named cesium. One time we got drunk. Cesium and polonium and I climbed up a huge above-ground oil tank. Don't even know how many gallons were in there but we were high up. You could see all the stars from there and it got me to thinking about the vast beauty of the night sky.

As we lay on our backs looking up I said, you know, I bet if we put our heads together we could come up with something like that. So that's what we did, the great experiment gone awry. And now only madmen worship at our feet.

I'd like to continue my comments on the bomb Complex Transformation. And I'm going to be using an oratory inflection. I've never tried this so bear with me. But I don't want you to be frightened. I'm going to be speaking loudly. We have 10,000 nuclear weapons in this country and deployed across the world. Much of

this arsenal is of 5 megaton bombs of greater magnitude. We have delivery systems of submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, cruise missiles and aerial bombs. One bomb can potentially vaporize a million people if dropped on a city. Why? It's been 62 years since the first two nuclear weapons were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Another nuclear bomb has not killed since. Another 62 years will not unfold so fortunately. With technology increasing in ever--complexity, hypersonic torpedoes and supersonic missiles it will be impossible to avoid the next nuclear bomb from exploding. One nuclear bomb exploding anywhere in this world will create an unintended--an unended retaliation regardless of who was responsible for the bomb. The world will be thrown into emotional chaos and retaliatory strikes will end life on this planet. Therefore it is imperative that a massive stand-down of all nuclear weapons begin immediately. We have no time to lose. Killing indiscriminately, polluting our planet with plutonium and destroying the dreams of civilization are on our shoulders. Stop this madman nuclear priesthood now. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Our next speaker is Gloria Tatum, then Charles Hughes and Anne Hughes.

MS. TATUM: Hello. My name is Gloria Tatum. I'm from Decatur, Georgia. And I'm a mother and a grandmother and I'm concerned about their future. Complex Transformation, hmm. Complex Transformation is a great Orwellian name for the redevelopment of nuclear weapons. It's a good place to hide. You can call this whatever pretty name, putting nice adjectives on it that you want but this is a death industry. This is a death industry that feeds on fear and makes billions of dollars for a few people. The bottom line is money for the few and hard times for the rest of us. We tell other countries that they can't have nuclear energy or nuclear weapons while we have more weapons of mass destruction than any country in the world and now we want to build more, more powerful nuclear weapons. This is insane, gentlemen. This is clearly insane. Our foreign policy is do as I say, not as I do. And we all know how this double standard works with our children. Why doesn't the Atomic Energy Agency inspect us for violations? Now, what does nuclear weapons--what does that give us? It gives us dead people. That's the purpose of it. Polluted environment, cancer, birth defects, more and better targets for terrorists. It expands the arms race and

makes us less safe. We don't have enough water to water our yards but you're telling us we've got plenty of water to cool down nuclear reactors. And then how about all the nuclear waste? Let's just keep piling it up. If we all had our very own nuclear missile, everybody in the world, would you feel safer? I want a world free of nuclear weapons. That's how I would feel safer. I want my country spending billions of dollars on healthcare, education, housing, renewable energy sources. That's how I want my country to spend its money, not trillions--and we have spent trillions already--trillions of dollars on the death industries and war. I want a future where our environment is not polluted with nuclear waste, where our young people are not contaminated with depleted uranium and fraudulent wars for empires. I want a forward-looking people who don't hold outdated and failed nuclear policies of the past. I say no to expensive nuclear suicide for this country and I say yes to life because another world is possible.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker Charles Hughes, then Anne Hughes and Danny Feig.

MR. HUGHES: My name is Charles Hughes. I'm here from Decatur, Georgia. I am a retired Presbyterian minister. I am a member of Veterans for Peace and my

military service goes back to the days of Korea. I'm also representing the peacemaking committee of the Presbyterian Church, the presbytery of greater Atlanta.

And I came here on the WAND bus. I have very little to add that's new. I'm going to have to say a large Amen for everything that has been said.

VOICES: Amen. Hallelujah.

MR. HUGHES: And, God willing, before the year is out I will have lived 80 years. I'm really concerned for my four children and twelve grandchildren and all the children in the future generations. Today I think I learned a lot about language and the meaning of language. We've been talking about transformation. It's not the way I understood the word. Complex Transformation seems to me to be just code words for developing and updating new and more effective ways of killing people. That's not transformation to me. I really am concerned about the future. I think instead of rearming, building more arms, we ought to disarm and get rid of all nuclear weapons, as others have so--have basically said. Instead of telling other nations what we think they ought to do, we better look to ourselves and get rid of our nuclear weapons. Instead of spending so much money in new development of nuclear weapons and more effective we should use that money for

constructive purposes. About half of my 40 years of ministry--or our ministry was spent in the United States and about half in Latin American countries. In many of those countries when we went there as co-mission workers we heard that there was a lot of anti-Americanism. But what we found out is--living among the people, many of whom were in very dire economic straits, we found out that they loved North Americans individually as people but they despised our government policies. They felt that our government policies were designed to keep us on the top of the heap and them perpetually on the bottom. Please let's get rid of nuclear weapons. Let's use our resources, our God-given resources, to help other people have decent lives, a chance of normal development. That's the greatest thing we could do for peace and for our own security. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Before we go on I just want to check with Gina. How are you doing? Okay for now? Okay, thanks. Our next speaker is Anne Hughes, then followed by Danny Feig and Glenn Carroll.

MS. HUGHES: My name is Anne Hughes. I'm from Decatur, Georgia. I came on the WAND bus. I'm a grandmother of twelve children. I'm a member--

MR. HUGHES: Four children.

MS. HUGHES: Oh. Excuse me. That's my better half. I'm a mother of four children and we have twelve grandchildren. Thank you. But I remember the second World War. I remember Hiroshima. I remember Vietnam.

I remember the Cold War. And we had some stressful and serious moments during all those years. But I have never been more worried about the future for our grandchildren than I am today. Our grandchildren are growing up in a culture of violence, of fear, of war and of arrogance--

FEMALE VOICE: Yes.

MS. HUGHES: --learning that our country can do anything. We can violate treaties. We can tell others what to do. We can condemn them and judge them. But it's okay because we're number one. That worries me a lot. They're learning morally that we can spend billions on weapons that are designed to kill thousands of people when we should be making our country safe by joining with the international community and giving people around the world food, freedom from disease, simple housing, clean water that will give them a decent life and then maybe they wouldn't want to be terrorists. Maybe they wouldn't want to speak out against us. That's what we should be spending our money on. If we, the most powerful nation in the

world, with all the money and resources and intelligence that we have--if we can't do something about this, who in the world can? And I remember something that Joe Lowry said the other night that reminded us of a slogan that's very apropos. When the people lead, the leaders will follow. So I hope we will all go back to our homes and do something to affect this policy through our legislators. Let us speak out. We are the people and we do have power.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Now Danny--is it Feig or Fige [phonetic]?

MR. FEIG: Feig.

MR. LAWSON: Feig. Sorry. To be followed by Glenn Carroll and Hartmut Ramm.

MR. FEIG: Thank you. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak today. And I'd like to thank the folks who I talked with who work at the Savannah River Site. I think it was quite enlightening to discuss with them what they actually do. I really don't think I've ever done that. I've been to the site but really didn't have a chance to just have one-on-one conversations. And it gave me a different perspective.

I feel coming here from Atlanta--I'm a home remodeling contractor in a down economy and I chose to take a day off in hard times because I felt so strongly about issues that I've been working on for--off and on for 30 years. You have a kid, you sort of take some time off, do some different things. But hearing them it gave me a chance to think about where I would be if I were in their position and somebody came from another town and said, we don't like what you do. We don't think it's the right thing. We think it's morally wrong. We think it's economically wrong. It's environmentally wrong. But I was trying to hear that these were people and these are people who are working here and they earn a living. And I just imagine if somebody came up to me and said, sorry, we don't need any more carpenters, you're out of luck. Well, I'm trying to think what I would do. And I think with the billions of dollars that we're talking about it's certainly with the great minds that are at this facility--we have no doubt some of the greatest scientists, some of the greatest minds in the country. There's no doubt about it. We look--you know, and I know that there's some good work that's being done here. They're working on alternative energy. There are some--there's a lot of environmental cleanup to be done here. And the techniques that are

being developed here are definitely, you know, things that have to be done unfortunately, you know, from the mess that's been going on for 50 years. But I think there's another way to do this and that the alternative would be do retrain, to start thinking of other ways that these folks who are hardworking can be put to work in our economy. There's plenty of things that we need and they've all been mentioned here today earlier. I think it's interesting. I found it kind of fascinating that this NEPA, the whole process is talking about significantly--things that significantly affect the quality of the human environment. I can't think of anything that affects the human environment more than what we're talking about today. And the devastation just from the dollars that are withdrawn towards this program from other programs, it's appalling really and it's very unfortunate. Talk about 5 and a half trillion dollars over 50 years and we think about the state of the world and what 5 and a half trillion dollars could have taken--where that could have taken this world today. I think we wouldn't have near as many problems that we have in the world. And I think about--I'm intrigued by the transformation talking about a reduction in square footage. It's very interesting that--that so much is talked about in the

square footage of facilities. Personally I think that's totally irrelevant, but I go back to the '80s and the old federal discussion of mutually assured destruction, MAD, where the Russians and us are in a room filled with gasoline and we each have a match. And, you know, it doesn't matter who lights the match first. You know, and now that room has gotten smaller with more--more parties involved and everybody's got the match. And the more matches you add to that someone's going to be less trustful of the next guy and someone's going to say, I'm doing it right now, boom. And it's over. You know, it doesn't matter how small you make the complex. You're still making the same product. And to me it's totally wrong. And, you know, a lot of folks said to me, you know, why would you go there and speak today. Why would you spend your time? Why would you waste your time? It's a waste of time. Nobody's going to listen to you. I think the folks who were fighting slavery probably had the same thing said to them, you know, and I think the folks that are here are a witness to the concern that people have in our world today. And, you know, I'm really interested also in the connection of Westinghouse and Toshiba and the connection--Westinghouse has a long history here at Savannah River site and Toshiba's purchase of

Westinghouse and the fact that now the Japanese, who the only weapons of--the only nuclear weapons that have ever been used were used upon them, here's a major Japanese company now running the facility making these same weapons. Something's wrong here, totally wrong. And I can't imagine that people in Japan would support this kind of program.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. FEIG: Okay. And finally, you know, we're not here to take away people's jobs. I hope that the folks who work--the hardworking folks who work here understand that. That is--would never be my intent and I don't think it's anybody's intent to do that. I think we're just looking for a different way for people probably to earn a better, more long-lasting living. And I go back to Albert Einstein, I guess, who said the unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking and thus we drift towards unparalleled catastrophe. I'd like to see us drift the other way. I hope you'll take that to heart, whoever is listening, you know. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Glenn Carroll followed by Hartmut Ramm and Jim Bridgman.

MS. CARROLL: So much to say. So much has been

said. And I'm amazed to be here today with my community who is so strong and so clear and has held the floor all day. This is new and lovely. We have only done this for less than one human lifetime. We entered into this without one word of public debate. It's been sold to us as inevitable. We know how to do it. We'll do it. Well, God bless NEPA. Now we're here. Now we're almost 20 years into this debate, almost a generation and we haven't made nuclear weapons. You could call it inertia, but I'm going to call it momentum. I think we're forgetting how to de facto disarmament. And we're holding it. We're here. We're holding it. But there's work to be done. There's 35 million gallons of high-level waste in 50-year-old leaking underground tanks with a 10-foot water table. And this has been the situation for the 20 years I've been an activist. That's what we want to do. This is our national defense is to save the Savannah River, the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf Stream, the future from this legacy. And so we have a new frontier. We need to develop nuclear waste management. We'll call it the De-Manhattan Project. Look what we did in just a few years. Not only did we develop this technology in secret, perfect it, if you will, and then we put up huge factories all over the country in just

the shortest time span and it was all because of our will and our focus backed by our genius and our curiosity and our good will. We thought we were doing the right thing. Here we are. We made a mistake. And we are the crown of creation. It says on the front page of the Bible we were made in the image of our creator. We are a creative species, naturally. We had to discover what uranium was all about and what all this crazy stuff would do. And now we know. And what really gives me hope--I'm just proud as punch of the people who got here today. You know, this is the third time we've come out for this and there's just been this beautiful growth of awareness and understanding. I remember when I came here and somebody from Westinghouse came up and was friendly and said hello and I was like--and I went back and I had to reflect upon myself. Who was the jerk? It was me. You know, who was the nice guy? You know, hey, we're all in this together and we have to learn, you know, to build on our common human impulse. We love our children. We love the air and the water and the sunshine. Now we can get there and agree. And this is why I believe it's possible.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MS. CARROLL: There is this compelling image that

was given to us and it came directly from the bomb and from the rockets that we've built so we could deliver these bombs. And this was a picture of our home. And we saw it for the first time in its exquisite beauty. And we saw it was little and we saw it was finite and we saw it was destructible. And we knew we were having a common experience. We were all in this experience together. And I believe we're making a start here today in South Carolina, the biggest complex in the country with the most radiation to move forward into the frontier and solve these problems and live long and prosper.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Hartmut Ramm, then Jim Bridgman and Mary Reilly. It's now a little after 2:15. At 2:30 I will take a 5-minute--that's a 5-minute break for everybody to stretch out.

MR. RAMM: Good afternoon. My name is Hartmut Ramm. I'm a retired emeritus professor of physics, of philosophy and physical geography. And I really don't have that much to add to what's already been said. But I have to say that these areas into which I poured my professional life have led me to some rather grim

conclusions that I will share with you and that haven't been talked about yet. I came, first of all, to the conclusion that nuclear weapons production--the nuclear weapons themselves and the facilities are fundamentally and profoundly incompatible with environmental stewardship. That is because there's no place to put them. My physical geography has taught me that. There is no safe repository for nuclear waste. When the nuclear arms race was put into motion, was--was kicked into overdrive by the first Eisenhower administration we knew very little about how the earth works and we knew very little about how radiation--how dangerous radiation is. We knew very little about how--how dangerous low levels of radiation are. It wasn't until 10 years after we kicked off the nuclear arms race that we learned from plate tectonics that continents reside and oceans reside on large lithospheric plates that continuously collide and scrape and subduct beneath each other and continuously create and activate new earthquake zones and new volcanoes. So there's no safe haven for our nuclear waste and this has made all the more unavoidable and irredeemable because of the danger that we've discovered in the meantime of the danger of even low levels of radio--radioactive waste. So what does that mean? That means, to me, this is a grim

prognosis. But it does mean that eventually all of the nuclear waste that's around now and that will be produced by this and all other programs will eventually end up contaminating our planet. The only real question is will it happen in decades or centuries or millennia. I worked out--just while I was sitting here I worked out three half-lives of plutonium. In three half-lives of plutonium we--if we talk about three half-lives of plutonium that's 24--actually I forgot what the number was, but it's roughly 100,000 years. And in three half-lives what happens is that--hold on. Wait a minute. That's--actually I think I did the math wrong there. Excuse me. But in any event--yeah, that is--that is correct. It would be--it would be an eighth. In three half-lives you'd have an eighth of what you started with which means if you started out with 8 tons you'd still have a ton left. And that's enough to pretty much devastate any very large continent. And so the point is that there is no good place to put it. So eventually it's going to end up in the--in the atmosphere. In the best case it will be just maybe millennia. And I suspect that most of the people who work on nuclear weapons hope that something else will get us before that does and so then they won't be culpable. I suspect because they know

the--they know what I know. They know that. The other thing though that bothers me even more is that--well, is the worst case analysis. The worst case scenario is that these weapons are actually used. And this is what bothers me most profoundly. This is my most grim--my grimmest conclusion because I think that the reason for these new--this new push, this new arms race impetus is to produce bombs that we can use. I think that we do know that--that we do have people in power--we know that our political elite is loaded with people who can cheerfully contemplate the use of nuclear weapons and even have said so openly. These are our new Strangeloves. As a matter of fact, I would say that--I would say that all supporters or all boosters of the Bombplex are our new Strangeloves. Interestingly enough, the character on whom Strangelove in the eponymous movie was--was based was actually a composite of William Teller, the great bomb nuclear physicist, and Henry Kissinger.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. RAMM: Henry Kissinger had just come out in opposition, along with, as actually our first speaker mentioned, Ms. Reilly--along with 70 percent of all still-living secretaries of state including Colin Powell, our national security advisors and our--the

department security--Department of Defense security advisors. They all have signed on saying let's--we have to abolish nuclear weapons because they have no more--they have no rational purpose. If they ever did in the Cold War, they certainly don't have any now. So I'm--what I would suggest is this, that what needs to be transformed is not the bomb complex, it's the military-industrial complex. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jim Bridgman, then Mary Reilly and Lewis Patrie.

MR. BRIDGMAN: Hi. My name is Jim Bridgman. I'm on the board of Nuclear Watch South and I want to thank Glenn Carroll for encouraging me to be here. It's very meaningful to witness all the great testimony that's going on. It's very depressing and sad though that, having been engaged in or married to this issue for 25 years, we still have to do this. And that's--that's a sad statement. I think, you know, what we are doing here today is trying to represent and support a lot of those who can't be here today. And so I want to help support and represent people like me who have heightened anxiety because of the threat of nuclear war. I want to help support and represent the people who have lived through such a horror and for the ones

who miraculously continue to witness into old age against these weapons. I want to help represent and support the people who have been unwitting subjects of nuclear experiments and have to learn that even in a supposed democracy government can commit evil. I want to help and support the people who have worked for years at facilities and now suffer debilitating heavy metal poisoning or cancers from cells gone mad from radioactivity and yet their own employer and government turn against them to deny health coverage. I want to help support and represent the brave whistleblowers who are punished for pointing out safety hazards and security weaknesses. And how can I do that? Well, number one, we've already heard today that DOE tried to place and NNSA tried to place a wall between the comments we're giving and what they're allowed to do, saying we are only taking orders. We only want to hear your feedback on this specific proposal. That's wrong.

The director of NNSA and the Secretary of DOE sit on the Nuclear Weapons Council and help form policy. So just as a general or a doctor or someone will give you general advice and expect you to carry out the specifics, we want to say no more nuclear weapons and expect you to carry that out. Back in '94 shortly after I arrived--at least back from '96 after I arrived

in D.C. we had the Contract on America. There was a lot of talk about cost benefit analyses and if we really totaled the cost that we've have already incurred at nearly 6 trillion, the thousands who have suffered health consequences across the country from nuclear testing in those facilities, the environment that now we have water contaminated at every site in this--in the country and beyond where we've done testing, you know, it's truly tragic. And we can only look forward to more if this plan goes forward with new facilities and new nuclear weapons. I think there was a time shortly after the Cold War where we experienced a threat blank. And the generals were very eager to replace that with new threats. But let me ask a question. Did our huge arsenal prevent 9/11? No. Okay. Did we use nuclear weapons against Iraq to go after weapons of mass destruction? No. Thankfully, no. Okay. These weapons are now irrelevant. We should be working with the other major nuclear powers to draw them down to a level where we can seriously engage those that we are urging not to develop nuclear weapons.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. BRIDGMAN: I want to urge you to read this essay by Jonathan Shell that appeared in last month's

Harper's. It's called The Moral Equivalent of Empire.

It does a very good job of articulating the Bush doctrine and how imperial it has been and contrasting and comparing that to a rule by law and consent. And what is his main conclusion coming out of this? That we must abolish nuclear weapons. So I'm very happy to see on the website of Senator Obama that he supports the Nonproliferation Treaty and that he is supportive of the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons. 'Cause I think what we are doing is we are playing with fire. Okay. We're going to burn in it if we don't take care with it and seek to dismantle it rather than modernize it and perhaps one day use it again. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Our next speaker is Mary Reilly. She will be the last speaker before our break.

And in case I don't get your attention before we break Lewis Patrie, Dan Richardson and Mary Olson will be the first three speakers when we return. Ms. Reilly.

MS. REILLY: Thank you. My name is Mary Reilly and I came over with the WAND group from Atlanta. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak out this morning--this afternoon. I had never been to a hearing before and I came today because I wanted to be heard. I don't think I'm going to say much different than

what's been said today, but I do want to be counted and I appreciate the time to be heard. I'm a taxpayer and I'm a person of faith. And I came here today because I believe that as stewards of our nation's resources we need to be accountable to each other and to God for the sake of the earth's health and for the security and well-being of our children's future. I'm here to say no to the financial squandering of tax dollars that we don't have for weapons that we don't intend to use, to say no to the unacceptable risks of nuclear bomb production and stockpiling. I'm here to say no to the profiteering of the weapons industry that grows and grows at the expense of our environment and real security. I'm here to say honor our treaties and dismantle our nuclear arsenal. Use federal funds to clean up the nuclear waste mess and to build instruments not of false security but of real peace. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. As announced, we'll take a 5-minute break. Don't go far because we're going to start over at 2:35.

[Break 2:35 - 2:40 p.m.]

MR. LAWSON: Okay. We're about to begin. And I have to ask you if you want to speak to go outside the room. We now--we did a little manipulation here.

There are evidently some young people who are leaving by bus in a few minutes and we've made an arrangement for Fielding Dillard Russell to speak as our first speaker so that he can leave on the bus. And that's been approved by the next speaker that I had announced, Lewis Patrie. So if nobody has any objections I will take Dillard--Dillard right now, please. Dillard Russell.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you. As you've heard, my name is Fielding Russell. I'm 18 years old. Turned 18 in January. And on my 18th birthday my mom said that she--she marveled at the fact that there's an adult in this world now who grew up not knowing the Cold War or did not know the war on terror. I come from Rabun Gap Nacoochee School. I drove 3 and a half hours to get here and I'm really glad I get to speak today. And I'm going to take a little bit different note that's been said previously. And I'm eighteen. All of you--most of you here today have been elderly or intelligent, wise, respectful and experienced. And I'm not. I'm a high school student. I'm intelligent for my age, I've been told, and I believe myself. But you know what? You all are a bunch of really wise intelligent people. But so are people who made this. And this is

twenty-four pages of intelligent work that I can't argue against because I'm only eighteen. And these people, just as intelligent as y'all are, and they can argue for the exact opposite things. And so I mean he can talk about, you know, nuclear weapons is a good thing and I think that he can convince my generation, all the billions of--you know, people who wrote this can convince my generation that this is the right thing. But you could, too. And it's by doing things like this, by standing up in front of this podium that you guys can do that. And you know what? I was raised in Japan. If you have these--the WAND things with the cranes on them, there's a story on the back of these cards about this girl who died from leukemia. I lived in Japan for 4 and a half/5 years and I was taught in Japan about this, not from the American perspective, from the Japanese perspective, which is we have--we're the only country that's been nuked so why would we ever want that for ourselves? And my dad who's American, just like I am, he tried to explain to me exactly why, you know, America wants nukes and stuff. And I was just instinctively revolted by the whole notion that he would want to bomb somebody because I had been raised the Japanese way, I guess. So it was an incredible experience for me to live there, but to come here today

in front of you and--and just say that I'm scared for my generation because they might believe this or that they might think this because there are other intelligent people out there who do believe this. I want you intelligent people, you wise people with your experience to help my generation out by doing what you're doing today. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Before we go on I'd just like to thank the young people who came today. I really appreciate the time that you've taken and those of you who have spoken spoke very well. Thank you very much for coming. And before we start, Mr. Patrie, we've been asked if somebody could ask the folks who are in the outer room to tone it down a little bit. It's a disturbance and it makes it difficult for everybody to hear and focus on what's going on here. Thank you. Our next speaker then will be Dr. Patrie. I appreciate your patience and he'll be followed by Dan Richardson and May Olson.

DR. PATRIE: I'm Dr. Lewis, L-E-W-I-S, Patrie, P-A-T-R-I-E. And I am chair of Western North Carolina Physicians for Social Responsibility, an organization that has been in existence at the national level for 47

years and has been concerned about the dangers from nuclear weapons during that entire period of time, which has--the dangers have waxed and waned but some of the principles that are--that exist have been true for that entire period and more. One of the issues is the dangers to human health from nuclear weapons, their production as well as their possible potential use. We are concerned because there have been deceptions and secrecy that obscured the actual dangers from these weapons and in their production, their manufacture, their storage and the ultimate disposition of waste materials. As a psychiatrist, I have tried to help people during my career understand the false assumptions they make in their own lives. And as a former employee of a federal agency, I realize that it's very difficult to withstand the assumptions that are surrounding you as a federal employee 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. I think that--I hope that perhaps you can hear the--what you may consider the irrelevant arguments that have been made by some of the people here today. They're not irrelevant to most of us here, but they may be judged irrelevant by the agencies that consider these arguments. I would like to say that we are all occupants of the great liner Titanic that I call Earth and that we all are subject

to the same risks. Those subjects are--dangers are--affect not only us but our children and all of the children that come after us. I have hopes that it won't be just our opportunities to go directly to our elected officials and try to convince them of the concerns that we have but that you, too, might be moved by some of these testimonies that you have heard that should impact on you beyond the things that you assume and take--maybe take for granted in your official capacities. We need your help as well as our own to get the message to people in the executive and legislator sections of our government to make policy. An official copy of my comments in much greater detail will be forthcoming. But I will summarize what I have to say, that this hearing process is insufficient to evaluate the environmental impact of the proposed Bombplex, as we call it. New studies are needed on the medical, public health and climate impacts of the life cycle of the Complex process, specifically including respective testing in the use of nuclear weapons that it would produce. New research has indicated that there would be significant climatic effects if there should be an accidental or purposeful nuclear war. Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR has argued that these global climate effects would lead to famine and disease claiming more

than a billion human lives around the world, perhaps the end of human life as we know it. These conclusions are relevant to the environmental impact of this proposal. Human risk--we ask that a human risk--have human health risk assessment of the proposed nuclear weapons production activities, future nuclear weapons testing, environmental cleanup and the legacy of nuclear weapons production and the future of nuclear weapons in--and their possible use be conducted, that a future role of nuclear deterrence and nuclear weapons in support of U.S. national security be articulated by the Department of Energy with appropriate support from other departments--

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

DR. PATRIE: --that DOE compile and disseminate the results of epidemiological studies which have woefully been lacking in the 60-plus years of the nuclear history of our world be carried out and that the Department of Energy abandon the effort to redevelop nuclear weapons production because they're costly, destabilizing, unnecessary and unhealthy and they focus instead on clean--and that they should focus instead on cleanup tasks necessary to respond to the significant environmental and public health harms caused by the Cold War nuclear weapons production

activities that should have ended more than a decade ago.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Now call for Dan Richardson--

DR. RICHARDSON: It's Don Richardson.

MR. LAWSON: Excuse me. I am--just one second, please. Don Richardson?

DR. RICHARDSON: Don.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. And the next speaker after him will be Mary Olson and then Dave Jacobs. Sorry, sir.

DR. RICHARDSON: Okay. Good. I am Don Richardson. I'm a retired pathologist presently on the national board of Physicians for Social Responsibility and I have boards in nuclear medicine since 1974. 1974--I'm older than dirt. Well, nothing has changed since 1974 to convince me that nuclear energy is not the worst idea ever conceived by the brain of our species, which--the worst idea by the brain of our species, which I call not homo sapiens but homo rapiens. Now, Ted alluded to five--four alternatives that he put on the screen at the beginning of this program. I suggest that there's a fifth alternative which is to abandon the first four alternatives. Upton Sinclair--some of you older people may remember Upton Sinclair. He said it's difficult for a man to

understand something when his job depends on not understanding it. And I think that's part of the problem. Okay. We've heard talk about--we've heard talk about fear, fearmongering. We are Muhammed Ali in his prime. We are Muhammed Ali in his prime. And we have people trying to tell us that we should be afraid because Tiny Tim has joined Nautilus and is working out. I don't remember exactly the term that was used.

Let me describe the program. I call it transcendental constipation. We have reached the point in our history where every nation with even modest infrastructure--even modest infrastructure can build a bomb. And we are encouraging that. Security is no longer a military concept. Security is essentially an environmental concept. It's an ecological concept. We will get no security from weapons. We will only get security by putting that money into infrastructure that will serve the human race.

FEMALE VOICE: Amen.

DR. RICHARDSON: There is no such thing as a division between so-called civilian uses of nuclear energy and military uses. If you have the civilian uses you will have--you will have proliferation. You will have it. Ted did talk about deterrence. And I submit that you cannot deter a stateless terrorist

group. There's nothing--there's no place to bomb. So deterrence is no longer a concept that applies to terrorists. It applies to nation states that have established military structures. You know, we've spent a lot of time and somebody has already said telling the rest of the world how to behave. Well, we have totally lost our moral authority to tell anybody how to do anything. I've got 10 minutes here but I'll just hit a few points. Let me just give one example of the possible terrors that we are facing. Everybody here remembers Chernobyl in the Ukraine.

FEMALE VOICE: Only because the high school students left.

DR. RICHARDSON: Except for maybe the high school students. They released 50 to 100 million curies into the environment which then covered all of Europe and eventually the entire world. 50 to 100 million curies released at Chernobyl. Seven years earlier at Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania they came within 30 minutes of releasing 18 billion curies. Now, if you do the math what we're talking about is an accident that's 180 to 360 times worse than Chernobyl, which was the worst disaster in the history of nuclear energy. And, of course, you know, the incidents and accidents at nuclear power plants, if put into a book, would look

like the Manhattan phone book.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

DR. RICHARDSON: 30 seconds. I can do it. Of course, we--you know, we--we need to put the money into renewable energies. You know, they're cheap, they're fast and they don't hurt us. I can finish sooner than that. I'm used to saying that we are a nation of psychotics. We're out of touch with reality. We think that we can continue the lifestyle that we have led for these many years. I may have to amend that. After listening to all these people I think there are still some sane people in the world. Okay. Now, they're talking about new construction of nuclear weapons and nuclear power plants. It's possible that we will build one or two plants, but I think at that time reality and economics will catch up with the industry and it will die out. Avery Levitz is fond of saying that you can't resuscitate a corpse. You know, you can put the paddles on and the body will jump off the table, but at the end of the exercise you still have a dead body on a cold table. Now, nuclear engineers are among the brightest people in the country. They're brilliant people. They may be ethically challenged but they're brilliant. These people can be retrained for useful work.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Mary Olson, who will be followed by David Jacobs and Elizabeth Baldwin.

MS. OLSON: Before I introduce myself I have a confession. I wanted to offer you each hugs because when our community comes in that's what we do is hug each other. And you guys have been really left out today, but I'm too shy. So I gave you cranes. But please know that it was part of my intention to offer you a hug. And if you want one later I'll probably still be here.

My name is Mary Olson. I'm the southeast regional coordinator for Nuclear Information and Resource Service. I got a promotion recently. Okay. It's just a new name for what I do. We are a networking clearinghouse for people who are concerned about nuclear energy nationwide and through our affiliate, World Information Service on Energy based in Amsterdam, worldwide. But we're kind of a small organization and so we are here to serve other groups through our information. We haven't always had a position supporting nuclear abolition. And to us nuclear abolition has to include the military and the commercial arms of this insanity. So to support

everybody who's already spoken today, nuclear weapons--there's nothing surgical about them. They are WMDs, weapons of mass destruction. They are indiscriminate weapons and therefore the world court has ruled them illegal. So our country is engaged in criminal activity here. Now, I don't want to say that I think Ted and our facilitator and individual members of this team are particularly held responsible and I actually agree with what Ted told us, that it's incumbent upon us to recognize that these policies ride on Capitol Hill and in the White House. And if we have anything about us we need to understand that in this next election cycle and every other one that we're alive to be part of we have to hold these candidates to our criteria. And once they're in office we have to ensure that they cannot stay in office unless they meet our criteria. And yet Jim Bridgman is also right. So he's the one who said all of y'all, you hang out in all those rooms and all those circuits and we know you have influence and we expect you to listen to us and wield your influence. And I'm going to have to tell you that I'd like to come and do a sermon and speak from the heart and do a spiritual thing, but I've been here today listening and I have to abandon the comments I brought and tell you that the spin that's going on in

this presentation totally completely overlooks a major component. Now, I'm going to go there but first I have to say thank you to NNSA for honoring its out-of-court settlement with the communities that were impacted by the first-generation of bomb-building. We would not have this NEPA process if it were not for the allied organizations and their rights of nuclear accountability that sued the Department of Energy and they settled for a NEPA process on any new facilities because they didn't get a NEPA process on cleanup. So thank you, communities, for having stood up and we have to thank you for honoring that. Every time I come and say that. So we're talking about something that's going down; right? And part of what's going down is plutonium disposition. And I'm proud to say that Nuclear Information and Resource Service is an intervener on that process and I'm proud to be in the room with representatives of the co-intervening groups, Nuclear Watch South and Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League. The three organizations are challenging the plutonium fuel portion of disposition.

So on page 22 we heard about tritium at Savannah River site. Well, people have been talking about tritium at the Savannah River Site for so long that tritium is like a non-existent word in this community. We did not

hear about plutonium disposition. And that plutonium is traveling through either Atlanta or Columbia as we speak. If it's coming through Columbia then it's coming through the community I live in, in Asheville, North Carolina. I mentioned that five of us came down early this morning to be here because we are directly impacted by these programs. And I challenge the idea that transportation is a minimal impact. The only way you can do that--the only way you can say that is if you average the consequences of an accident or an attack across the entire U.S. population, which is what they do to say minimal. Forget Asheville. Forget Columbia. Forget Atlanta. If there's a big problem they will be minimal impacts because we are such a small percentage of the total population. That's how they come up with those words. Those wiggle words--

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MS. OLSON: Okay. My last little comment here is that I don't get it. You've been listening. And I get it that you picked a nice low number, but it's just like the dieter who breaks their diet by eating this big huge gorgeous piece of chocolate cake--you know the kind--and when they're challenged by a loving partner who says, gee, why did you do that to yourself, they point to the whole cake and say, oh, but I didn't eat

that. Okay. So eighty bombs a year, hmmm. How many are we making now? How many are you hearing you want people to make? They're going to be pushed like crazy to make a whole lot more. So it's this push-pull process and all I want to say is you use these words so amazingly. It's a hedge against an uncertain future. This is where I want to go in your heart and say, have you ever been married? If you've been married you know that hedge can determine that future. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker is David Jacobs. Is Mr. Jacobs here? And he will be followed by Elizabeth Baldwin and Michele Mitchell.

MR. JACOBS: Good afternoon. I've been sitting here all afternoon long trying to figure out exactly what I was going to say because there's so many things that could be said. You and the other people that work with you to make the decisions in this process stand in a position that will affect the history of all humankind and all life on this planet. I'm 56 years old and I've always lived with the nuclear bomb. There's such a thing in this world that's called background radiation. Back when people first learned about radiation, talking about curies with radium and other people like that, there was a background

radiation of--let's call it X. Well, today we're more than twice that. That's in less than 100 years or around 100 years we're more than twice that original background radiation. And when we start looking at the wastes that are already--not buried but kind of like just laying in the ground where these plants were, when this radiation spreads throughout the plant, gets into the river and then goes down into the ocean, travels around the whole planet, the background radiation will go up and up and up. And at some point the background radiation becomes so high that you just won't have any human beings living because there'll be too much radiation and--and we'll die too fast from it. The radiation--you know, little bit of radiation that might cause you to not get sick for 20/30/50 years. But it causes you to get sick. More radiation causes you to get sick faster. Eventually there's enough radiation that we'll just die too fast to reproduce. And then we're gone. And who knows how many other forms of life on this planet will go because of that radiation and how many cases of changes in--in life forms because of that radiation. We might already have done--we might already have killed the human beings off. It might take 50/100 years for this radiation that's there to turn around and maybe 1,000 years for it to get

completely, you know, for enough of it to get out to--to kill off who knows how much life. But, you know, eventually, whether it's 50 years or 100 years we'll find out whether or not we've increased the radiation background level to the point that we're all dying. To start building more bombs is wrong. And there was no alternative in this statement for the success of building more bombs. I mean the statement speaks that we have the capacity to produce so many pits a year. Well, how many pits are we producing in a year and isn't every pit that we produce a new bomb? And haven't we been producing these bombs all along even though for the last 20 years we were supposed to not be producing them? But didn't our president just within the last year or so admit that we have developed this--the definitive nuclear weapon for blowing up a building or facility 800 yards beneath the earth--the surface of the earth? And then, you know, a couple of days later he said he was speaking theoretically. But he's--you know, he was ready to--to actually use nuclear weapons. But everybody basically stood up and said, no, you can't do that. And even though he knew that no one could touch him legally he knew that he didn't have the support of humankind.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. JACOBS: And humankind does not support any alternative that allows the production of more pits, that does not cause the concentration of the disassembly and--of nuclear bombs and the study of how to deal with the radiation waste that we have to deal with in order to prevent the raise of the background radiation as much as we can. This is the issue that is before you. Think about it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Point of clarification.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Point of clarification.

MR. LAWSON: Ma'am, excuse me. Ma'am, ma'am.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just one moment.

MR. LAWSON: Just one moment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, please, just one moment. 1974 background radiation was 75 millirems. Now it's 360.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Our next speaker is Elizabeth Baldwin to be followed by Michele Mitchell and Kim Karris.

MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. Thank you for the chance to speak. I'm Elizabeth Baldwin. I'm the second person today to come up with a poster showing the Hiroshima-Nagasaki destruction. I struggled with myself over whether I should do that because is it too

shocking? Will it put people off? Is it inappropriate? But I decided it is appropriate because I think the only reason we've held on to nuclear weapons for these 62 years is that it's taken a really long time for people to understand what these weapons actually do.

FEMALE VOICE: Could you hold it up a little longer? We didn't see.

MS. BALDWIN: The people did get it. People did get it. And that's why the nuclear freeze movement surged in the '80s. But by then it was too late because the nuclear weapons industry was making too much money. They had control of the politicians and they still do today. Now it's really up to the people.

We have to lead and the leaders will follow us, as has been said earlier today. The great majority of the people around the world believe that these weapons are too barbaric to possess, let alone use. You cannot believe in a humane God and still think it's okay to point these weapons at children, babies, old people, anybody anywhere. As has been said many times today, the weapons are proliferating. The only hope for human survival is for the United States to lead the word--world toward mutually verifiable nuclear disarmament. That's all I had. But I just wanted to

say one thing. This--this man died quickly after this photo was taken because he's carbonized from the waist down. But this man up at the top, he's still alive. His name is Mr. Yamaguchi. He's in Nagasaki. And that heat ray burn on his back healed, sort of. It's a leathery substance. It's not like skin. It doesn't breathe. It doesn't sweat. He's in constant pain and he has to keep putting salves and ointments on his back all day long. But he's grateful because he feels he's been kept alive all of these years to be able to warn people about what nuclear weapons do. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Michele Mitchell, to be followed by Kim Karris and Peter Evans.

MS. MITCHELL: Thank you. Thank you everyone here. I'm so thankful for your caring and helping people--the average citizen to become awake and aware of the dangers and issues and with--of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy and other such things that some of us haven't even heard of. And I appreciate that strength and support and being able to not be caught up in the situation so much that it's just--it's such a--it's like a day of mourning. But it's also a day of remembering that there are survivors and evidently were

made to survive situations. I was--I, too, care to offer my care and support for the people of Japan, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, very much and they--their courage that they have in speaking out about what they've gone through and to help us to avoid other similar type situations. I was reading in the Essene Gospels of Peace how the earthly mother and all of earth are born of the holy springs of life. I thought that is--was so new to me to consider that we were born with the whole earth in creation and that all creatures are at the brotherhood to man right now in heaven. And so I just was applying my thought in spiritual healing, how to heal this situation that we're going through, activism and talks and we have voting and other such freedoms. And a gentleman earlier spoke how to imagine a world free of nuclear bombs. And I think if we go to a positive living thought of a world free and safe and in harmony and peace and in healing whenever the--the proposition or thought or image of such weapons that are not allowed that--by holy law or spiritual law present themselves that we can work with other meditation and prayer practice that will be answered. We are supposed to be a world free of such weapons.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MS. BALDWIN: And thank you very much for

continued good works.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Kim Karris and she'll be followed by Peter Evans and Dr. Rose Hayes.

MS. KARRIS: Thank you. My name is Kim Karris. I am from Atlanta, Georgia. I am the program director of Atlanta WAND. And I am 25 years old. I'm here on behalf of myself and many other young ones who couldn't be here today to say no to Complex Transformation. I'm not a nuclear expert, but I do know how long radioactive materials live. And I know that the only difference between a new and old nuclear weapon is the amount of people that it kills. Both of them kill every time. I also know that there are 35 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste sitting at Savannah River Site and I know this because I saw it. I just recently went on a tour at SRS and I have never been more convinced that our security, our country and our lives are in serious danger. I think they do these tours--SRS does these tours to make you feel better. But it actually made me feel a lot worse. You know, the young generation is working harder that you realize for change, for progress, to change the way we eat, to change the way we live, to change the way we think.

But our wheels are spinning. We are watching our grownups, our leaders tell other countries they cannot have nuclear weapons, threaten to attack them if they do, but then present to the American people Complex Transformation, a plan to build modernized, more efficient nuclear weapons. Young people are stunned. We are hurt. We are angry. We learned about the NPT in school and we believed the government when it said that we would move away from building new nuclear weapons. We are begging you to start cleaning up the radioactive mess you've made, start working for a peaceful solution and start protecting our future. We're talking about environmental impacts. Well, what are we going to say when the time comes when we have to test those nuclear--those new nuclear weapons to see if they work? Our children will have to live with your decision and I just want to say please do not let Complex Transformation happen to us.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Peter Evans and then Dr. Rose Hayes and Amanda Hill.

MR. EVANS: Hello. I'm Peter Evans from Aiken. The group called Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness frequently present letters stating that the residents of Aiken want nuclear expansion in Aiken. Neither I nor anyone I know has ever been surveyed by

this group. I and many other Aikenites are very worried about having radioactivity contaminating our aquifer and the Savannah River and about materials going into the air in the event of an explosion. If our water becomes contaminated that will be disastrous to us both physically and financially. Can the government afford to pay for the cleanup and damage in the event of an accident of this magnitude? Look what problems they're having right now with the Katrina damage. I understand that you have been having problems with radioactive materials polluting the aquifer at your Hanford, Washington site. I wish you would submit an article to the Aiken Standard newspaper detailing what has occurred at Hanford and what pollution you can and cannot correct there. Then tell us how this differs from the Savannah River Site. This would give the citizens of Aiken more information to decide whether or not they want more nuclear activity here. I do not understand why you are wanting to introduce more very deadly materials to a large and growing metropolitan area. I also cannot understand why you aren't removing every bit of buried material from the Savannah River Site, especially since this is an earthquake fault line area, that is, fault lines running right in that vicinity. Radioactive material

should not be sent to Aiken now when it currently does not have the means for processing them.

MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, sir. Just one second. For those people who are in the back of the room if you'd like to speak could you go outside, please. Thank you. Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. EVANS: Aiken should not be a nuclear depository or, as it appears especially from the article in the New York Times this past Sunday, a growing nuclear dump. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Dr. Hayes is--passed on speaking and so the next speaker would be Amanda Hill and Ms. Hill will be followed by Jean Korera.

MS. HILL: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Amanda Hill from Atlanta and I'm with Women's Action for New Direction. And I am here to act out for a new direction to stop funding of the Bombplex. I'm an electrical engineer. I graduated from Georgia Tech in 1992. I worked as an engineer for TRW and an aerospace technologist for NASA. I mention this so that you can know that I understand. I understand the industry and I understand government contracts. I have sat through many, many PowerPoints justifying overexpenditures, missed milestones and delayed schedules, MLRS, the multiple--multiple launch

rocket system, Patriot missile systems and DOD launches. After a while you forget what your end product is, what your objective was in the first place.

I woke up one day to realize sadly it was about money. This is only about money and greed. I am here to remind you what your end product is, what your end gain is. It's weapons of mass destruction and mass destruction of people, of women and of children. And there are exhibits in there to show you that though you think you may not use it, it has already happened. And it can happen again very easily. Your end objective violates our international treaty and destroys our integrity in this new world. Bombplex is not about defending our country. This is not about keeping us safe and it is certainly not a deterrent. It is an oxymoron to think that you can wage war to create peace. You cannot build nuclear weapons to have security and safety. Please clean up, do not build up Complex Transformation. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jean Korera. Jean Korera, Jean Michel Korera. No? We'll start with some new names. Ella Ruth Hunnicutt and Ms. Hunnicutt will be followed by Anne Karlyn Babb and then a combination of Sara Buford and Marguerite Bauer.

MS. HUNNICUTT: I'm Ella Ruth Hunnicutt. And I'm

not a rocket scientist. I don't know what the opposite of scientist would be. Not common. I'm not common. I'm educated, but I am sort of overwhelmed that my educated friends do not seem to know much about nuclear weapons. I don't know if they even read the newspaper. Yeah. They do read the newspaper. But it is a little bit surprising. My concern, one of my many, is about plutonium. And it's my understanding that there will be some factory here at Savannah River for plutonium. If one little speck is inhaled one gets lung cancer. You know, that's pretty--pretty scary to me. I mean that's one of the many scary things. Okay. I appreciate everybody that came and added so much from all different backgrounds.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Ann Karlyn Babb. Ms. Babb here? No? How about Sarah Buford and Maguerite Bauer? And following them will be Leslie Miner and then a combination of Marcus Lewis and Micah Barnwell.

MS. BARNWELL: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Mica Barnwell and you are?

MS. BAUER: Marguerite Bauer.

MS. BARNWELL: And you are?

MS. LUTENBACHER: Rocio Lutembacher.

MS. BARNWELL: And we are 14, 14 and 12. And we're here with the Horizon School from Atlanta,

Georgia. And it's kind of weird standing here, you know, shorter and really less educated than a lot of the people who came up here and spoke their minds and knew what they were talking about. I mean I don't have a lot of facts to back me up, what I'm going to say. But I'm here because I think it's wrong to keep creating a bomb that's going to destroy our world. I mean we only get one and I'm mad 'cause we don't have the right to destroy a planet with so many other people on it. A small group of just Americans can't dictate the future of this planet. It's wrong, to me.

MS. BAUER: Hi. See, I don't see how we have the right to make one bomb, let alone give more money to make more. See, I don't get that.

MS. LUTENBACHER: It's not fair for what this generation does because what this generation does, it does to the next generation and the next generation and the generation after that.

MS. BAUER:: That's our kids.

MS. BARNWELL: We don't want that. We don't want a few wrong decisions to end up making the world an awful place.

MS. BAUER: I don't want my kids growing up in something like this, or worse.

MS. LUTENBACHER: It's not fair and we don't like

it.

MS. BARNWELL: We don't like it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. Our next speaker is Leslie Minerd, I believe I'm correct, and then there's a combination of Marcus Lewis and Micah Barnwell and then Iza Gustin.

MS. MINERD: I'm Leslie Minerd and I had another speech prepared but I'm going to have to give it at a different time. Ditto to what has been said here and I'm glad for this new generation coming around 'cause it was I guess the greatest generation that presented us with the atom bomb and a lot of this mess we're in, my mom and dad's generation. And we're continuing with this legacy. Sorry, you guys. And the generations in between haven't done much to fix it. Our political leaders have just gone forth and asked us--this idea of new bombs, it's a plan of DOE that's making it sound like they're going to make everything smaller and less and compact. I was outside. Reporters were talking to us, almost attacking us, saying, you know, like what, don't you know that the DOE said they're going to make this smaller? And I think they're still planning on spending a whole bunch of money and so the bomb they already have, they have a really long shelf life. They

still work. And I'm not quite sure why they had to come up with this whole new design. And don't think you're going to be completely safe under a new Democratic administration because some of these bombs, I understand, were designed under the last Democratic administration so that doesn't mean you have to lay down your--whatever. You need to be paying attention to what's happening. And this is all tied in--the same people that came up with this plan came up with the GNEP plan and it's all tied in together. And I don't know how we're going to stop them but we've about run out of money. I guess we're going to just keep borrowing it from the Chinese. But anyway, I think it's a bad idea and I hope you guys will just--we can use all those bombs that Bobbie from WAND--well, we can't use them but if you really, really need them you already have some so there's no need to make any more. Okay. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Okay. Marcus Lewis and Micah Barnwell. Then on to Iza Gustin and then Christian Garcia.

MR. LEWIS: Hello, everyone. I've been sitting down for the past hours looking at everyone's speeches and seeing that they knew what they were talking about. My name I Marcus Lewis. I'm from the School of

Horizons in Atlanta. Okay. Today the Horizons students were here to protest about the money that was being used for nuclear weapons while it could be using--while we could use it for recreation. The more we spent so much money--I mean we've only spent money on war and mass destruction when we could have been using it on other things like the disaster in New Orleans and other world tragedies. The government watches--thank you. The government watches what happens but spends--okay. I've said that. What I've always been watching on the news and what I've been seeing, people suffering and what kind of diseases they've been having I've been wondering--our class, World Cultures, about the killing that's been happening. I've seen that Bush has still been paying about other stuff instead of the more help he should have been sending down there. I don't see why they say bombs save our lives. They remove you from your homes and separate you from your families, which they don't need to drop bombs down on anybody for something that they can probably send somebody in to do for themselves. The scary part is if bombs are dropped anywhere people are just watching it on TV, watching people die even though they don't even know who you are. The fire doesn't mean that it's over after the

bomb hits. The radiation can spread through the air going to multiple cities. While I stand up here I really hope everyone understands everyone is entitled to their own opinion. I'm entitled to mine. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Iza Gustin. Is that how you pronounce it?

MS. GUSTIN: It's actually Iza Gustin.

MR. LAWSON: Iza. I came far away. I'm sorry. And then Christian Garcia and Barbara Joye.

MS. GUSTIN: All right. Well, my name is Iza Gustin. I live in Atlanta, Georgia, and I go to Horizon School. I'm fifteen years old. But I want to go to college, I want to have children, and I want to live a long and healthy life. But I'm scared of nuclear weapons and I'm scared of Complex Transformation. I honestly believe we can be spending our money on things like music classes for our schools, arts--art classes and, you know, helping people in our own country and maybe even other countries 'cause I think we're wasting our money 'cause we already have bombs that we have no use for. So I'm saying no to this plan. So please look out for my future and say no, too.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Christian Garcia, then

Barbara Joye and Hanh Nguyen.

MR. GARCIA: Hi. I'm Christian Garcia. I'm from Atlanta, Georgia, and I attend Horizon School. I didn't plan on speaking but then I heard everything and I remembered that I read in a book that we signed a treaty, I think. But I don't understand why Bombplex is going on and why new bombs are being made. We search for weapons of mass destruction but instead we're making them here. And I don't understand why that's going on. This is the first time I've heard about the Savannah--

FEMALE VOICE: River Site.

MR. GARCIA: --River Site. And I--it kind of makes me scared to drink the water now. Oh, I didn't drink it to start with but--hmm. Forgot what I was going to say. Well, I think people like my generation, my age, don't really get a chance to speak out and, you know, make a difference so I think that it's good that you guys are allowing us to come here and speak our minds. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Our next speaker is Barbara Joye and then it will be Hanh Nguyen. I'm sorry. I mispronounced that before. And then Sally Gusein, I guess.

MS. JOYE: I am an old one. I'm a retired state employee and used to work for an underfunded agency that dealt with health and human services. And before that I was a member of the staff of the Consumers--Georgia Consumers Utility Council and also in Washington at the Safe Energy Communication Council which dealt with the--the facade--civilian aspect of the news. Well, the information we have been given says that we're going--you know, the President and Congress made the determination that these gentlemen have to carry out to continue to ensure that this country has a nuclear deterrent. I don't disagree with what was said by a previous speaker about the Democrats, but nevertheless I must remind you that the President is going to be different soon. And I hope that Congress will be different soon also. And that may be a complex transformation. I hope it's simple enough for many to understand what's at stake. And we have to keep our eye on that process as well. Also one of the missions--part of the mission of the Complex Transformation plan as indicated on the first page of this handout is to meet our national security requirements and, as many of you have pointed out, it does not. There is no--there is an environmental impact issue that we're addressing today. Nuclear

bombs, both the production and accidental or deliberate deployment, has a 100-percent negative impact on 100 percent of our environment. That is obvious to everybody that has ever read anything about it. But it is denied by many. Nuclear weapons are not useful for war because--well, they might--they were at one time briefly when nobody else had them. That was wonderful, wasn't it? And so after that moment had passed I think we're pretty well assured that if we use one for war of any kind, whether strategical--those little teensy nuclear bombs they're talking about, a little bigger than the one that was used in '45. If we use one I assure you there will be retaliation. There's no reason why there wouldn't be, is there? Think about it. We might get lucky. But even if we were lucky and we used it and they get their way--I don't know why I would say we--they get their way, some sort of false victory, it'll come around. We won't be exempt from the environmental impact, the destruction, the horror and the slow death, if not fast death, that will ensue on this continent as well. That's what's different now. America is not used to that. I want to just briefly say--conclude by saying that as I was riding the bus here I suddenly realized that the image that comes to mind when I think about nuclear weapons is

that they are, in fact, nothing more than a high-tech enormous suicide bomb that we have strapped to our expanding waistband as a country since 1945.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Hanh Nguyen and Sally Gusein and Terrence Dicks.

MS. NGUYEN: Well, my name is Hanh Nguyen. I'm seventeen years old. I come from Horizon School as well. And I'm here just because of the motivation that the W-A--WAND committee has given me to, you know, tell you in these letters know about the whole plan of the U.S. government and I really--I mean--okay. My idea is that I think that I really--I'm terribly sorry for what people had to--I mean people like you, like the really talented people and may have interest or get, you know, benefits from, you know, building the whole, you know, killing system, whatever it is. I mean complicated one. And I'm sorry if that's your interest or your--what your enjoyment or whatever it is, but it's not right and it's just killing people. I mean I don't know what to say but I should have just write a speech or something. It's--anyway, and--okay. I think that's basically what I needed to say.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Sally Gusein, is it?

FEMALE VOICE: This is my mother and I think she definitely needs to go up there.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. We're going to go on. If you decide you'd like to speak a little later we'll take you. Terrence Dicks. Is Terrence Dicks here? No? Ronnie Lee Sallywhite? No?

FEMALE VOICE: He's here.

MR. LAWSON: Oh, okay. They could be next.

MALE VOICE: [unintelligible]

MR. LAWSON: Pardon me? You're passing?

FEMALE VOICE: No, he's not.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. And following him will be Kris Phelps and Adele Kushner.

MR. SALLYWHITE: Hi. Good evening, everybody. My name I Ronnie Lee Sallywhite and this is my first time I've been here. I really enjoy it and I met friends--what you call right there raising her hand.

And I enjoyed coming here and it's real nice. But everything about it we've got to put it in God's hands.

Let God be the first and everything will go the way we want. And I really enjoyed coming out here. And thank y'all and have a blessed day.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Kris Phelps to be followed by Adele Kushner and John Lindsey.

MS. PHELPS: Hello, everyone. My name is Kristin

Phelps and I'm 19 years old. I'm a first-year student at Agnes Scott College and I'm studying international relations. I am part of a generation who is well-represented here today because we're the generation who will have to be dealing with these weapons long after those who have profited from Complex Transformation have died. Now, I'm not an expert in economics. I do understand the concept of average variable costs. Average variable costs are the costs that go up as you produce more. Well, what could cost less than stopping production? I mean, sure, streamlining our nuclear complex might cost less than we're spending now, but wouldn't it ultimately cost less not to make any new nuclear weapons? Your plan claims that the Savannah River Site has enough water adequate to support all facilities. It's on page 19 in the blue section. Well, as a lifelong resident of Georgia I have never known there to be enough water for anything. There's not enough water to water our plants. There's not enough water to wash our cars. Not enough to swim in pools. Sometimes there's a threat of not enough to drink. But there's enough water for weapons. There's enough water to kill people. Apparent--well, when I graduate and I start a career in international relations I would like to see

an international system for my generation, for my children's generation and my grandchildren's generation that's ruled by justice and basic human rights, not nuclear might. I--I don't want one of the bumper stickers which says, why am I still protesting this. I don't want that on my car. I don't want to be 50 and back here. So what I'm saying--thank you for hearing me, but are you listening to me?

MR. LAWSON: Thanks. Our next speaker is Adele Kushner and to be followed by John Lindsey and Holly Garrett.

MS. KUSHNER: Well, I'm very glad to be here again for--I don't know--the third or the fourth or the fifth time, or whatever it is. It gets to be old hat but there's always something to be said for just trying again. In this case we agree. A lot--most of us here agree we don't want or need more nuclear weapons. We have more than enough. What we need is water, as the last speaker just carefully said. Water is an essential for life. It is also a requirement in the production of nuclear weapons, even of electricity. Next summer more drought is a real possibility. In fact, there are some who have predicted it will happen. The Savannah River is already impacted. It has a lower depth, lower flow. Not only the river is

affected but there is an aquifer under the ground that I'm told serves five states. That water is in trouble, too. I guess we know that. Okay. Now there's a new proposal I just heard of to withdraw 13 percent of this already depleted supply in order to cool the Vogtle nuclear plant. Now, is this--is this what we should be doing with our scarce resource? Water is becoming more and more scarce. It is--it is something we all need. We know we need it. We know there's a problem. Will we have to choose between drinking water or water for growing our food or for cooling power plants or for making weapons? This is a choice. I hope the PEIS has the solution to the water problem. One more environmental problem is--I forgot to say I do represent an environmental group and we have really dug into this. The next problem is the geologic fault that runs through this very region, runs all the way up to Charleston, which was almost destroyed when they had that great big earthquake back in the 19th century. It could happen again. It could happen anytime. It may never happen in our lifetime, but it could. But now what the normal city would have when it has an earthquake, we have this huge concentration of radioactive material. And what would an earthquake do to that? That could be a mess. So I hope that is

covered by the PEIS. I wish everybody luck. And I'm old enough not to have to worry, but I do--I'm concerned about my grandchildren, too. So I hope somebody can do something about this to stop. If this is fearmongering it's fearmongering.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. John Lindsey is our next speaker and will be followed by Holly Garrett and Elaine Cooper.

MR. LINDSEY: I'm John Lindsey. Today the U.S. spends more on defense than the rest of the world combined. All right. Hello. I'm John Lindsey. Today the United States spends more on defense than the rest of the world combined. How did we get here? In the '50s I remember building a fallout shelter in our basement with my father. Fear is how we got here today. We don't need more nuclear weapons. We need less defense spending and less war profiteering because that's what it is. People today driving this spending on defense are the ones making the profits for it and we all will pay. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Next speaker is Holly Garrett. Following Ms. Garrett is Elaine Cooper and Michael Berg. Is Michael Berg still here?

FEMALE VOICE: He left.

MR. LAWSON: He left. And then it would be Judith

Lomas.

MS. GARRETT: Hello. My name is Holly. I am from Anderson, South Carolina. I'm 25 and I'm a bit nervous. I've got lot of things going through my head so I'll try to be coherent and clear. First of all, I'd like to say that I'm really happy and excited to see this democracy in action right now. We've got people speaking their minds and it's wonderful. And it's equal opportunity for everyone to speak and not to be judged. So I just--I'm really excited to see that happening. So I was also really happy to see in your presentation that you mentioned environmental justice because I think that's something that's overlooked a lot in environmental impact assessments. I think the whole word environment needs to be challenged, the definition of environment, because it's so much more than just our physical environment. It's our social, it's our cultural, our economic, our political environment, our mental environment. It's total. It's everything. So I would just ask that you guys take that into consideration. I saw that, you know, the impact assessment was very comprehensive, but to also--to please don't overlook those who are

marginalized and ignored a lot of the times. So let's see. I'll just cut to the chase. This is a matter of life and death. And I think that I was really happy to see the young lady say from the Horizon School we only get one. We only get one planet. That's it. So there's a quote that I read once and it said, those people who do not learn from history are bound to repeat it. And we're the only country that's ever dropped a bomb on anyone else, and we've seen what happened. And if we can't learn from that, if we can't think about that every time we talk about having these discussions and recognize that that's the reality of nuclear weapons. That's what happens. And like Mary said, it's indiscriminate. It doesn't choose--it's not precise. You can't have tactical precision nuclear weapons. It's total. It's total destruction. So I think the best decision for our country is to completely stop moving forward on this project. There is no reason to invest our money here. There are so many other things we could be investing our money in right now, education and healthcare and cleaning up the mess that we've already made by all these wastes that are spilling. My friend told me up in Oak Ridge there was--they were transferring some uranium tetrafluoride or chloride or whatever from one container to the other

and they over or undercalculated--I mean accidents happen or we make mistakes. We don't always calculate it right. And sometimes spills happen. There was uranium liquid flowing out of this container up in Tennessee. And that's scary. That is really scary because if it can happen there it can happen anywhere.

And I would rather it happen in a contained place than out on the highway somewhere in Atlanta or Nashville or Columbia. So we have a lot of work to do. We need to provide food and water for a lot of people who don't have it. These are things we should be spending our money on. So I guess in closing I have a vision for my community. I have a positive vision and I think we can move forward with this vision. I think we need to--we need to stop scaring one another and we need to start building communities and ones that are sustainable. So one of the--the root of community also has the same root--the word communication also has the same root. And I think that's really important and like what we're doing here today, open communication, and, you know, we have a representative government supposedly.

FEMALE VOICE: Supposedly.

MS. GARRETT: So it says, you know, it's by the people for the people and I think that, you know, in this day and age we're moving to a global community and

it's not just our people but it's all human beings on the entire planet. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Elaine Cooper and then Judith Lomas and Dzung.

MS. COOPER: A lot of people are leaving. Can you wait a few minutes? Okay. I'm Elaine Cooper. I don't normally speak in public so I'm kind of shy. But anyways, I'm from Columbia, South Carolina. I am a homeowner and a taxpayer for 30 years here in South Carolina even though I have a Chicagoan accent. But I'm so glad to talk after Holly and since Holly spoke for me because, sirs, change is on the way. I will say that I am most positive that it will be a Democratic president and change is on the way. With that said, I do believe it's up to each individual to hold that person--hold their feet to the fire. Each person should make a difference and challenge and birddog the candidates and hold their feet to the fire and ask them--more than ask them, to encourage to cause change to happen. You, too, each individual can cause a change in a positive way and that way is saying no to Bombplex. You can do it. Change is here. Change is afoot. Change is happening. Bombplex is part of that old Bush and Clinton whole thing that's been rolling along with the bombs and--and change is now afoot.

This is about to end. We see the momentum. We see young people standing up. This is a time of baby boomers. A huge group of young people are standing up and voting for the first time. People in their 20s who have never voted. Change is on the way. And they were about to say no to Bombplex. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Judith Lomas. Is Judith Lomas here?

FEMALE VOICE: She's here.

MR. LAWSON: In the meantime is Dzung here? It's D-Z-U-N-G.

FEMALE VOICE: There he is.

DZUNG: My name is Dzung. I come from Vietnam. You know Vietnam? My country is famous. People in Vietnam think that American think that you are bad. You are mean. Think that you want to kill people, want to destroy our country because of the war in my country, because of the war in Japan, because of the war in Korea, and Iraq and Afghanistan. So please don't make another weapon that can destroy my country and other countries because we are ourselves human like you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Judith Lomas. Is Judith Lomas here? Did we find Judith Lomas? Well, I'm going to assume that she is not here. And that's

the names--that's the total number of people I have on my list. And this is great in the sense that we have 2 hours before we start up again. I'd like to thank you all for your participation and your comments, especially for the young people who came today and participated. It was really great to see. Once--also please note that we have a session tonight. It begins at six o'clock with the open house with public testimony beginning at 7:00. And remind you that you may continue to submit comments on the SPEIS until the comment period closes on April 10th. This then concludes this hearing on the Supplemental Programmatic Impact Statement--Environmental Impact Statement for Complex Transformation and this hearing is adjourned at 3:58. Thank you.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages numbered 2 through 116 is a true and correct transcript of the proceeding held before me; that said hearing was reported by the method of Stenomask.

I further certify that I am not kin or counsel to the parties in the case, am not in the regular employ of counsel or said parties, nor am I otherwise interested in the result of said case.

This the 19th day of March, 2008.

GINA L. SMITH, CCR, CVR
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
GEORGIA CERTIFICATE # B-2151