This Week's Update — How should we confront with damages caused by harmful rumors? (9th April, 2012)

GEPR Editorial Staffs

This Week's Column

1) Radioactivity panic in Japan is calming down on the surface. However, it still affects the society, being a reason for rejecting Tohoku debris for disposal, for example. Why is this thought born? Kosei Kato, a sociologist, contributes a column “Why science can not persuade against radioactivity panic." (English translation coming soon)

Mr. Kato estimated this panic "a religious terror rather than a scientific issue". The actual condition of people who has been in the panic is quite unclear, therefore, he would like to attempt a survey.

2) TEPCO (Tokyo Electric Power Company) will be reconstructed by government management with government holding stocks. However, the next top management has been undecided, and its future remains unclear. The reason is because all the financial damages of Fukushima nuclear accident are to be undertaken by TEPCO. TEPCO must pay compensation including ambiguous damages caused by harmful rumors. The Japanese Cabinet Office's Energy and Ecology Committee has calculated the cost of nuclear power plant, including reputational damage.

Is this idea right? GEPR editorial staffs provided a column “Who should bear the responsibility for nuclear accident's reputational damage? – Whether TEPCO should cover all costs or not". (English translation coming soon)

The cost of harmful rumors like this is not usually included in the international standards in the evaluation of environmental externalities in the power generation system. This column direct question at this.