

---

Subject: Open discussion on cancer.

Posted by [frijud](#) on Fri, 14 Nov 2003 20:26:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

background radioactivity. For example, if you were to get a liter of water from the Pacific Ocean, it would have needed several tons of water to get one atom. The general fallout from all of the weapons tests have raised the background levels.

Now personally I think this is a bunch of bull. Where as the background levels have increased,

States gets about 350 mrem (a rem is a measure of radiation dose, mrem is 1/1000 rem) per year.

This is an average. People in the Midwest generally get less, and people that live in the mountains or over granite deposits get over 1000 mrem. The estimated dose from the increase in background due to fallout is about 4 microrem. That is 1/1000000 of a rem. The math indicates

really matter.

I work with radioactive material every day (well during the week at least). Cancer from radioactivity is the least of my worries. The chemicals I work with are a greater threat. I would guess that any statically significant increase in cancer (if there is a statically significant increase) would be due to the increase of various chemicals rather than radioactivity.

---