



1. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

1. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

2. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

2. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

3. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

3. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

3. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

4. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

4. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

4. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

5. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

5. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

5. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

6. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

6. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

6. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

7. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

7. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

7. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

8. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

8. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

8. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:





1	1. The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.	1. The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.
2	2. The independent variable is the variable that is manipulated or changed by the researcher.	2. The independent variable is the variable that is manipulated or changed by the researcher.
3	3. The dependent variable is the variable that is measured or observed by the researcher.	3. The dependent variable is the variable that is measured or observed by the researcher.
4	4. The control group is the group of subjects that does not receive the treatment or intervention.	4. The control group is the group of subjects that does not receive the treatment or intervention.
5	5. The experimental group is the group of subjects that receives the treatment or intervention.	5. The experimental group is the group of subjects that receives the treatment or intervention.
6	6. The results of the study show that there is a significant difference between the control group and the experimental group.	6. The results of the study show that there is a significant difference between the control group and the experimental group.
7	7. The findings of this study suggest that the independent variable has a positive effect on the dependent variable.	7. The findings of this study suggest that the independent variable has a positive effect on the dependent variable.
8	8. The limitations of this study include the small sample size and the lack of random assignment.	8. The limitations of this study include the small sample size and the lack of random assignment.
9	9. The implications of this study are that the independent variable can be used to improve the dependent variable.	9. The implications of this study are that the independent variable can be used to improve the dependent variable.
10	10. The conclusion of this study is that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable.	10. The conclusion of this study is that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable.



than the... matters were all published  
on the... which are public documents  
and a net... the... the  
operational... the...

... these must all been  
careful... reasonable  
period... responsibility  
ability... In other  
instances... which  
have... studies  
have... the problem  
was one... Nevada and Utah  
human... attributed  
to... taken in conjunction  
with... in which the  
needs had... which  
these... It was concluded,  
from... while there had  
been... that could not  
have... which the... had  
up...

... way to answer these  
and... the cooperative  
effort... a vital role has been







By using the available knowledge of the oceanic circulation they have been able to estimate the activity of the circulation near a wide range of latitudes. Currents in the tropical and subtropical regions have been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the mid-latitude regions is being extended. The oceanic circulation in these latitudes is characterized by an increase in the number of

The oceanic circulation in the mid-latitude regions has been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the tropical and subtropical regions is being extended. The oceanic circulation in these latitudes is characterized by an increase in the number of

By using the available knowledge of the oceanic circulation they have been able to estimate the activity of the circulation near a wide range of latitudes. Currents in the tropical and subtropical regions have been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the mid-latitude regions is being extended.

of the oceanic circulation they have been able to estimate the activity of the circulation near a wide range of latitudes. Currents in the tropical and subtropical regions have been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the mid-latitude regions is being extended. The oceanic circulation in these latitudes is characterized by an increase in the number of

The oceanic circulation in the mid-latitude regions has been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the tropical and subtropical regions is being extended. The oceanic circulation in these latitudes is characterized by an increase in the number of

By using the available knowledge of the oceanic circulation they have been able to estimate the activity of the circulation near a wide range of latitudes. Currents in the tropical and subtropical regions have been studied in detail and the knowledge of the circulation in the mid-latitude regions is being extended.



For example, the probability of a person being struck by lightning is about one in 10,000,000 per year. This is a hazard which is extremely small.

It is not surprising that traffic fatalities are a significant hazard. The number of deaths per year is small. But the number of people who are injured is large. These injuries are often severe and can result in permanent disability. It is in these cases that the hazard is not so small.

The most common hazard is the one which is most likely to occur. This is the hazard which is most likely to be avoided.

It is not surprising that a value of 100 is acceptable as a hazard level. If the level at which a hazard is acceptable as a hazard level, there would be no effect at all.

The hazard level is not a constant and is dependent upon the nature of the hazard. For example, the hazard level for a nuclear power plant is much higher than the hazard level for a small building. The hazard level for a nuclear power plant is much higher than the hazard level for a small building. The hazard level for a nuclear power plant is much higher than the hazard level for a small building.

The hazard level for a nuclear power plant is much higher than the hazard level for a small building. The hazard level for a nuclear power plant is much higher than the hazard level for a small building.

SUMMARY

The acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system in the mammal have been studied in the rat. The acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are overwhelmed by the effects of the radiation on the general condition of the animal. The acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young. The acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young. The acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young.

When the acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young. When the acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young. When the acute effects of radiation on the reproductive system are the reduction of the rate of delivery of sperm, the reduction of the rate of delivery of ova, the reduction of the rate of delivery of embryos, and the reduction of the rate of delivery of young.

study of a single mutation. The experiments require hundreds of repetitions to be statistically important. We see no possibility whatever of being able to determine the exposure levels from radioactive fallout that have occurred.

GENETIC EFFECTS

Radiation does not only damage somatic cells but by acting upon certain organs of the germ cells it can give rise to alteration of the genes of the different species. It appears that there is no definite threshold for the effect and that there is a linear relationship between the frequency of gene changes and the total irradiation. It has been pointed out that the rate at which the radiation is given is a minor factor and is negligible factor.

The point of variation has been generally been made with relatively high doses ranging from a few mrem of C roentgens with mice to a maximum of several thousand rads in the case of the more resistant fish. Each species has its own range of sensitivity.

If one accepts that the linear relationship which has been experimentally determined holds for low exposures however small, then the extrapolation of the data leads to the conclusion that a small but finite probability exists of gene mutations at the level of the background level of the natural environment. That mutations do occur in all living organisms is well established and indeed forms the basis of the theory of evolution. At present, however,

we do not know the extent to which a low frequency is caused by the environment or by the environment and what is due to the genotype.

The extent of the effect of the new of the climate effect of the genotype on the survival of populations. Since many of the important mutations appear to be dominant lethals, their estimation would be based on the recognition of anomalous mortality but not the estimation of the numbers of individual genotypes in the population. The technique, which is well established in connection with animals, becomes very difficult to apply to plants and the population for obvious reasons.

Some of the mutations are recessive and consequently not be detectable in the heterozygous state. An individual carrying such a mutation would be able to produce an individual carrying the identical mutation.

The problem of the inheritance of the mutation is a problem. The fate of the mutation in the population is a more important question. These mutations are recessive and are subject to the forces of natural selection and may be maintained in the population, and may be expected to be maintained.

The extent of the effect of the mutation on the genetic problem in man consists of the inheritance of the mutation. The studies being conducted in the field of the inheritance of the mutation until the

statistical work has indicated it is possible that some evidence of genetic effects will have been observed among the more highly irradiated groups at high dose rates. At the lower exposure rates, it is not clear that such effects can be recognized.

John D. ...

Most of the information available to date is the result of development and testing of methods for measuring the effects of radiation quantitatively. No statement of the actual effects of radiation on the people of the United States can be made at this time. The data obtained on the actual values of the dose rate within the United States. These values have been accounted for in the present report. Additional information has been obtained from the

While the dose rate is never zero, we are forced to conclude that the deleterious effects of the existing levels of radioactivity in the United States, to the extent that they are at all, are very small. Among the myriad other influences of our environment, diagnostic and genetic import, we see no possibility of the causing any effect whatever on the general health.

STATEMENT BY DR. J. H. HENRIKSEN  
GENETICIST, DIVISION OF PHYSIOLOGY AND MEDICINE  
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
BEFORE  
THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The genetic effects of radiation are not limited to the exposed individuals. Descendants of exposed people may show genetic effects of radiation. What would be the best obtainable estimate of the magnitude of the genetic effects of radiation, taking into account the results of research conducted over several years and also the various uncertainties that may exist.

Each individual carries in his body many genes, or hereditary material, which are transmitted to his offspring. Several thousands of genes are transmitted from parent to offspring usually without change. A gene may, however, naturally change under natural conditions so that the gene in the offspring is different from those of the parent. This is the case with genes exposed to ionizing radiation is known, among other things, to cause changes or mutations. The frequency of these changes is proportional to the amount of radiation received. The frequency of genetic effects, therefore, is proportional to the amount of radiation received. For genetic effects, the total amount of radiation received before parenthood is important. The rate of exposure, or the duration of exposure, is not important.

Genetic effects of radiation are estimated for a million genes about 1000 mutations per year. It is estimated that a assignable cause in each generation of 1000 genes are exposed to one unit of radiation, or 1000 mutations per year. Therefore, 2000 genes may mutate.

The average dose of radiation from atomic weapons to date is about 0.0001 rads per year. (This instead of 5,000 mutations per year might be compared with 10 mutations in a billion genes per year per gene per population of 100,000 organisms.) It should be emphasized that these estimates may be either too low or too high, since they are based on animal experiments.

Gene mutations are usually deleterious. Since the term "deleterious" has been used here, it should be explained. The term refers to the effects of the genes on development, growth, and survival of animals. It is also important to distinguish between the two cases. First, when a gene with deleterious effects are inherited from one parent, when it occurs in one generation. If a deleterious gene mutation is induced and if an offspring receives the gene from both parents, it may have a particularly pronounced effect. In large outbreeding populations, the chances of receiving identical radiation-induced mutations are very, very small. The occasional cases may be particularly severe. The levels of radiation from atomic weapons are rare and spread out over so many individuals that a deleterious effect on birth and survival rates is unlikely. If an offspring receives a deleterious mutation from only one parent, it may be totally unaffected, or it may cause some observable harm, or its chance of survival may be reduced by 10 percent. This

is the more important case. When the increase may still be so few  
as to be lost among the varieties of the offspring being produced as  
a consequence of genetic analysis. So long as the amount  
of radiation is low, the genetic effects are correspondingly low.

STATEMENT BY MR. MERRILL EISENBUD  
MANAGER, NEW YORK OPERATIONS OFFICE, AND  
DIRECTOR, HEALTH AND SAFETY LABORATORY  
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
BEFORE  
THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY  
APRIL 17, 1957

Fallout monitoring has been conducted systematically by the AEC since early 1951. Two basic systems for collecting data have been employed:

a. Intensive monitoring is conducted relatively close to the sites of detonation, about 200 to 300 miles from the test site in Nevada. In this region, radioactivity is gathered after each blast by a variety of techniques: (1) aircraft which are equipped with instruments that measure the level of radiation; (2) instruments that receive radioactivity and automatically transmit the data to a headquarters by radio; and (3) manually operated radiation detectors. The monitoring system in this region is primarily concerned with measuring the short term dose from fallout. Being close to the site, most of the fallout may occur in this region within a few hours after the burst, at a time when the radioactivity is decaying rapidly. Most of it is delivered in a day or so.

b. In contrast, at more distant locations the monitoring system is designed to detect the low level fallout that is insignificant so far as immediate dose is concerned. When tests are under way in Nevada, a nation-wide network of stations provides a continuous record of fallout throughout the country beyond 200 miles.

At other times the number of stations was reduced to 11 because fewer locations were needed for the sampling of radioactive dust which originates from the deserts beyond the continental limits. These stations and the instruments used are listed in Table #1. The station which was not in the smaller network when Nevada tests were in progress is indicated by an asterisk.

This network was designed to detect and measure radioactive dust. Only on infrequent occasions could the determination be made directly with instruments located at the sampling stations. The normal radioactive background in the United States varies from about .01 to .05 milliroentgens per hour. At these low levels of activity the Geiger Mueller counter must be carefully operated by a skilled observer, and perhaps inflated to a level of 50 percent over the normal background and it is not known whether this increase was due to a fall in the normal variations in radioactive background or to a rise in the background. These small elevations of radioactive background are not detectable by a sufficiently sensitive instrument and probably it has been possible to develop a method of measuring activity which is exceedingly simple and relatively inexpensive. It is more expensive than direct instrumental measurement of activity and will be more difficult, as noted, to measure activity in milliroentgen per hour with even the best available detector. The method which we have used routinely is the method of measuring a measurement of

fallout equivalent to 20000 curies per hour.

Our procedure is to mount a gummied surface about 3 ft. from the ground. The sticky surface has adhesive properties when wet; thus, dust particles are retained over a rain. These gummied films are tendered by personnel of the Weather Bureau. The films are changed each day and are mailed to the AEC Health and Safety Laboratory in New York where their radium content is assayed by reducing the gummied film and the adhering dust to a fine amount of ash which is then assayed for radioactivity by conventional laboratory counting equipment.

Since 1951 we have assayed 100,000 samples in this way. An interim cumulative account of our findings was published in the scientific literature in 1952 and a further summary up to January 1, 1955, has been completed. Its schedule of publication during the next few weeks. The information has been made available on request to many interested persons who have wanted the information for a variety of purposes. These individuals include representatives of the photography industry and scientists working in fields such as carbon 14 dating.

The cumulative fallout in the United States from early 1951 to January 1, 1955, varies from 100 milluries per square mile in Arizona to 120 milluries per square mile in New Mexico. As a basis for comparison, it is of interest to note that the upper foot of soil in the United States contains an average of 100 milluries of radium per square mile.

The isotope Strontium 90, which is present in fallout, is regarded as the most important nuclide of biological significance. This is because, like calcium, it follows the same route into biological systems and may be deposited in the skeleton, where it would be removed very slowly. The strontium content of the soil here in eastern United States now is about 100 picograms per square mile of Strontium 90. Thus, when all testing material isotope is present in an amount about one ten-thousandth the amount of natural radium, the natural radioactive substance to which it is chemically and biologically similar.

WESTERN

EASTERN

Alaska  
 Arizona  
 Arkansas  
 California  
 Colorado  
 Connecticut  
 Delaware  
 Florida  
 Georgia  
 Idaho  
 Illinois  
 Indiana  
 Iowa  
 Kansas  
 Kentucky  
 Louisiana  
 Maine  
 Maryland  
 Massachusetts  
 Michigan  
 Minnesota  
 Missouri  
 Montana  
 Nebraska  
 Nevada  
 New Hampshire  
 New Jersey  
 New Mexico  
 New York  
 North Carolina  
 North Dakota  
 Ohio  
 Oklahoma  
 Oregon  
 Pennsylvania  
 Rhode Island  
 South Carolina  
 South Dakota  
 Tennessee  
 Texas  
 Utah  
 Vermont  
 Virginia  
 Washington  
 West Virginia  
 Wisconsin  
 Wyoming

Alabama  
 Alaska  
 Arizona  
 Arkansas  
 California  
 Colorado  
 Connecticut  
 Delaware  
 Florida  
 Georgia  
 Idaho  
 Illinois  
 Indiana  
 Iowa  
 Kansas  
 Kentucky  
 Louisiana  
 Maine  
 Maryland  
 Massachusetts  
 Michigan  
 Minnesota  
 Missouri  
 Montana  
 Nebraska  
 Nevada  
 New Hampshire  
 New Jersey  
 New Mexico  
 New York  
 North Carolina  
 North Dakota  
 Ohio  
 Oklahoma  
 Oregon  
 Pennsylvania  
 Rhode Island  
 South Carolina  
 South Dakota  
 Tennessee  
 Texas  
 Utah  
 Vermont  
 Virginia  
 Washington  
 West Virginia  
 Wisconsin  
 Wyoming

\*District of Columbia

\*District of Columbia