



## The media overflows with misinformation about Kvanefjeldet

The stories about Kvanefjeldet take up a lot of space in the media, which willingly colludes with all manner of considerations without competence or willingness to challenge the credibility of the sources and the professionalism of their statements. Often the half-sought solutions of NGOs and self-appointed experts are dangerous for both the environment and people. Citizens become losers in a game where they cannot tell spin from facts and professional research.

Greenland Minerals is registered on the ASX exchange. This means that the company must always behave fairly and document all calculations and solutions presented around the mining project. Over the years, approx. DKK 400 million has been spent on surveys carried out by leading international consulting companies. Nevertheless, Greenland Minerals is constantly confronted with amateurs who present self-styled alternative solutions without having oriented themselves in background analyses or just simple facts.

### **Alternative tailing deposit is indefensible**

Most recently, the media has published stories that it is much smarter to deposit the residual materials (tailings) in the "mine pit" – that is, where the ore has been taken from. That solution was assessed several years ago - and was deselected as less suitable for long-term storage. In addition, the

solution requires that tailings must first be deposited in a temporary landfill (Taseq), and then later moved back into the mine when production stops. By that time, the tailings will have settled and be extremely stable. It would, however, be irresponsible to follow that strategy. Yet it is presented as a great solution. This deceives an insecure public that is entitled to fair information. What is presented in the EIA is the result of extensive studies by independent specialists over many years, based on extensive research. The media chooses to present the opinions of experts that have not even reviewed all the material. Greenland Minerals has reviewed options extensively and has drilled a 500m deep bore hole from the edge of the lake in Taseq to understand the geology in the area.

### **Tailings can be covered with water or dry material**

Lake Taseq is extremely suitable for tailings due to the massive dense rock beneath the lake. The EIA report points out that instead of a wet cover, a dry cover maybe chosen. If a dry cover with clay, gravel, stones and plants is chosen, then no water mixed with tailings can run out. Not even if the dam - contrary to expectations - were to collapse. The barrier is designed to withstand a 1:10,000 year event in terms of both earthquakes and precipitation. Should the 247-metre (equivalent to 2.5 times the length of a football pitch) wide embankment collapse, the impact on the population will be less than 1 millisievert annually - even if they catch and eat 20 per cent of their fish from the Ilua bay, and this is the most extreme and unlikely scenario. If there was to be a breach it would be far less significant



### **No, drinking water is not affected**

The fluoride content of Lake Taseq is already above drinking water levels. The lake is not part of the drinking water supply, as the drinking water comes from that other water catchment area. So here, too, the scaremongering has taken on spin and is without a hold in reality. And the story that the wind is bringing water droplets from Lake Taseq into the drinking water supply to an extent that harms drinking water is refuted in detail in the EIA report. And if dry cover is chosen, even the theoretical risk of transmission of water droplets from Lake Taseq is eliminated.

The tailing depot is not a radioactive bomb

The manipulation reaches new heights when various NGOs and newsmedia describe the tailings depot as a radioactive bomb. Uranium and thorium in both the mountain and the tailings depot have a very low content. It is between 0.03% and 0.06% in the mountains. In the tailing depot, the content is between 0.02% and 0.37%.

Uranium and thorium in these low concentrations and in the stable form they have in the tailing's deposits, do not pose a risk to health or environment. Nevertheless, the so-called experts choose to compare radioactive waste from a



nuclear reactor to the uranium in the mountains and in the tailing depot. The question is whether it is an expression of a conscious desire to manipulate the population – or they just don't know better. The world's leading radioactivity experts – Arcadis – have also thoroughly researched the issue and completely dismantle the statement. Arcadis concludes that even in the extremely unlikely event that the embankment would collapse, the annual impact on the population would be less than 1 millisievert per year. This compares with the fact that the present natural impact on the citizens of Narsaq is between 8.5 to 10.5 millionrt per year. It is to derail the level of professional debate and mislead the public when it is claimed otherwise.

---

## **The neocolonial dreams of NGO's**

The 141 environmental organizations that have recently intervened in the debate on Greenland's future have finally thrown off the mask and announced their intentions outright. They want mining and extraction of oil and gas in Greenland stopped. The NGOs also propose that Greenland should be put on permanent passive support by the international community.

### **The NGOs' neocolonial dreams**

The NGOs will not just stop the project on

Kvanefjeldet. Their goal is that Greenland does not use its own resources at all.

141 NGOs write in a joint statement on 10 February 2021 that "We call on the Commonwealth and the EU to adopt new Arctic strategies that help protect Greenland's fragile environment. A moratorium should be imposed on large-scale mining and on the extraction of oil and gas. During this time the Greenland Government should be compensated for the possible loss of revenue from it".

With their call on the 'Commonwealth and the EU', the NGOs completely ignore the fact that Greenland has been granted autonomy and that the governance of raw materials has been repatriated from Denmark. Thus, only the elected



representatives in Greenland have the right to decide on greenlandic raw materials.

The NGOs also propose that Greenland should be put on permanent support from the international community - what is also called passive support for social clients.

This neocolonial mindset is extremely oppressive – but also recognizable to a population that has lived through the process before.

This brings us straight back to colonial times when the population is kept in a hopeless situation with no possibility of a job and a meaningful existence far removed from a minimum subsistence level with consequent social dissatisfaction.

#### **What's the next step for NGOs?**

Is it conceivable – once the NGOs have implemented a ban on raw materials – that the

next step is a ban on whaling? This would be entirely in line with the fact that the NGOs have already destroyed the traditional catch of seals through a broad international de facto ban on the export of sealskin. We wonder if the crusade against the Greenlandic people then continues with a demand that the regulation of shrimp and fishing quotas in Greenland be taken over by international authorities – who, of course, have more knowledge of sustainability. All of this will probably be done with the best of intentions for Greenland – at least according to the NGO's.

We urge everyone not to be misled by daydreamers who live a life far removed from the forces of nature in the Arctic, but primarily live safely in big cities in the West. Greenland has a unique opportunity to take care of its own future with jobs, hope and increased welfare. But it takes courage. And it requires serious discussions based on knowledge – and not random pseudo-arguments.

