

## Expert Medical & Scientific Organizations WARN on WIRELESS Radiation

### There is a Special Need to Protect Children



A large number of expert medical/scientific bodies have already issued warnings on the health risks of wireless devices that emit microwave/radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation (MW/RF-EMR). These organizations have urged for reduction on exposure to wireless radiation based on mounting scientific evidence of adverse health effects and inadequacies of the current exposure standards. Internet through a wire (instead of WiFi) and corded phones are a safety requirement for children.

#### **American Academy of Environmental Medicine (AAEM):**

[https://www.aemonline.org/emf\\_rf\\_position.php](https://www.aemonline.org/emf_rf_position.php) Note in particular how they explain the mode of nerve damage by wireless radiation: “The fact that RF exposure causes neurological damage has been documented repeatedly. Increased blood-brain barrier permeability and oxidative damage, which are associated with brain cancer and neurodegenerative diseases, have been found.”<sup>4,7,15-17</sup>

In 2013, AAEM specifically recommended only wired internet (no WiFi) in schools:

<https://www.aemonline.org/pdf/WiredSchools.pdf>

**American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP):** <http://www.saferemr.com/2013/09/american-academy-of-pediatrics-demands.html> This peak paediatric body stated: “Children are disproportionately affected by environmental exposures, including cell phone radiation. The differences in bone density and the amount of fluid in a child’s brain compared to an adult’s brain could allow children to absorb greater quantities of RF energy deeper into their brains than adults. The current exposure limits may not reflect the latest research on RF energy”

In a letter to the Federal Communications Commission and the Food & Drug Administration in August 2013, the AAP stated: “Current FCC standards do not account for the unique vulnerability and use patterns specific to pregnant women and children. It is essential that any new standard for cell phones or other wireless devices be based on protecting the youngest and most vulnerable populations to ensure they are safeguarded throughout their lifetimes.” However, these recommendations have been ignored so far.

#### **European Academy for Environmental Medicine (EUROPAEM)**

<https://europaem.eu/en/library/blog-en/97-europaem-emf-guideline-2016>

They state: “Studies, empirical observations, and patient reports clearly indicate interactions between EMF exposure and health problems. Individual susceptibility and environmental factors are frequently neglected. New wireless technologies and applications have been introduced without any certainty about their health effects, raising new challenges for medicine and society.” They also state: “On the one hand, there is strong evidence that long-term exposure to certain EMFs is a risk factor for diseases such as certain cancers, Alzheimer’s disease, and male infertility. On the other hand, the emerging electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) is more and more recognized by health authorities, disability administrators and case workers, politicians, as well.”

**National Committee on Environment and Children's Health of Cyprus.** Their information video (with English subtitles done by the Environmental Health Trust USA to protect children from wireless radiation: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H43IKNjTvRM>)

CHC website info: <http://www.cyprus-child-environment.org/easyconsole.cfm/id/324A> A presentation by the President of the CHC Dr. Dr. Stella Michaelides (paediatrician): [http://www.cyprus-child-environment.org/images/media/assetfile/Press%20conf\\_Dr%20SKM\\_web.pdf](http://www.cyprus-child-environment.org/images/media/assetfile/Press%20conf_Dr%20SKM_web.pdf)

**Ministry of Health of Israel:** [http://www.health.gov.il/publicationsfiles/bsv\\_sviva2014e.pdf](http://www.health.gov.il/publicationsfiles/bsv_sviva2014e.pdf)

Note the recommendations for schools: “recommends that students remain at a distance of at least 1.5 meters from electrical cabinets and that use of wireless communication networks in schools be reduced.” (page 70)

**French National Agency of Health Security of Food, Environment and Labour (ANSES) :** <https://www.anses.fr/en/content/radiofrequency-radiation-mobile-telephones-and-wireless-technologies>

It stated: “the Agency emphasises that children can be more exposed than adults because of their morphological and anatomical features, in particular their small size, as well as the characteristics of some of their tissues. It is issuing a series of recommendations aimed at adapting the regulatory limit values in order to reduce the exposure of children to electromagnetic fields, which starts from a very early age due to the expansion of the use of new technologies.”

France has recently banned wireless systems like WiFi in small children’s facilities such as preschools and marketing mobile phones to children. While a lot of French schools usually do not use WiFi due to prior recommendations favouring wired internet, the government now has now restricted WiFi use in schools – with limits on number of hours allowed and mandatory switching off when not in use.

<https://ehtrust.org/france-new-national-law-bans-wifi-nursery-school/>

### **Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (RNCNIRP)**

RussCNIRP consider necessary:

1. Ministry of Health and other organizations, responsible for the population safety (including children), should pay attention to the regulation of Wi-Fi use in kindergartens and schools; to the strengthening of sanitary control of the Wi-Fi using and to the development of an appropriate regulatory framework.
2. To recommend the usage of wired networks in schools and educational institutions, rather than a network using wireless broadband systems, including Wi-Fi.

Note also the report of the RNCNIRP filed by the World Health Org: <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/project/mapnatreps/RUSSIA%20report%202008.pdf>

It states: “Despite the recommendations, listed in the Sanitary Rules of the Ministry of Health, which insist that persons under 18 years should not use mobile phones (SanPiN 2.1.8/2.2.4.1190-03 point 6.9), children and teenagers became the target group for the marketing the mobile communications.”

RNCNIRP has clearly outlined the risks to children:

“the following health hazards are likely to be faced by the children mobile phone users in the nearest future: disruption of memory, decline of attention, diminishing learning and cognitive abilities, increased irritability, sleep problems, increase in sensitivity to the stress, increased epileptic readiness. Expected (possible) remote health risks: brain tumors, tumors of acoustical and vestibular nerves (in the age of 25-30 years), Alzheimer’s disease, “dementia”, depressive syndrome, and the other types of degeneration of the nervous structures of the brain (in the age of 50 to 60).”

**Californian Medical Association (CMA):** <http://www.saferemr.com/2015/04/california-medical-association-calls.html>

California Medical Association (CMA) Resolution 107-14, Adopted December 7, 2014

Resolved 1: That CMA supports efforts to reevaluate microwave safety exposure levels associated with wireless communication devices, including consideration of adverse non-thermal biologic and health effects from non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation used in wireless communications; and be it further

Resolved 2: That CMA supports efforts to implement new safety exposure limits for wireless devices to levels that do not cause human or environmental harm based on scientific research.

### **Medical Association Vienna**

An English translation of the statement on reducing mobile phone:

<http://www.wirelesstechsafety.com/medical-exposure-guidelines-em-radiation.htm> Poster:

<http://www.aekwien.at/aekmedia/Medizinische-Handy-Regeln.pdf>

### **Department of Public Health, Government of Land Salzburg, Austria**

[http://www.bioinitiative.org/report/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec22\\_2012\\_Precaution\\_in\\_Action\\_Global\\_advice.pdf](http://www.bioinitiative.org/report/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec22_2012_Precaution_in_Action_Global_advice.pdf)

### **Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)**

"The data on neurological damage and fertility-related issues is not conclusive. We need more large-scale epidemiological study on humans to confirm the cause and effect relation between radiation and its health effects. Till then, precaution is advisable," Dr. R S Sharma, deputy director general of Indian

Council of Medical Research (ICMR). Related presentation: <http://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Dr.Sharma.pdf>

### **International EMF Scientist Appeal**

**237 scientists from 41 nations** who have studied biological/health effects of artificial electromagnetic radiation and published in the peer-reviewed scientific literature have petitioned the UN and the WHO for immediate measures to protect public health from wireless health dangers: <https://emfscientist.org/>

### **Bamberg Doctors Appeal**

An independent group of German medical doctors (Bamberg Doctor's Report) signed by 175 doctors warned about health risks of wireless radiation in an Open letter to the president of the federal state of Bavaria in 2005. English translation at: <http://www.tetrawatch.net/links/links.php?id=stoiberlet>

### **International Doctors' Appeal Freiburg**

More than 1,000 doctors signed the Freiburg Appeal calling on support and demanding precaution with regard to wireless radiation in 2002 and again in 2012. [http://freiburger-appell-2012.info/media/International\\_Doctors\\_Appeal\\_2012\\_Nov.pdf](http://freiburger-appell-2012.info/media/International_Doctors_Appeal_2012_Nov.pdf)

### **Why We Cannot Rely on the WHO's International EMF Project**

Two arms of the World Health Organization (WHO) have dealt with health effects of man-made electromagnetic fields (EMFs)/ radiation (EMR):

1. **International EMF Project** – formed in 1996 to investigate health effects of EMR, highly criticized as an instrument of the industry risking public health. This small team at the WHO deny adverse health effects ignoring scientific evidence. However, a closer look at this group at the WHO show clear conflicts of interest due to links to the industry that produces the environmental pollutants they are supposed to protect public health from:
  - a. It has always been headed by an industry consultant without academic training in medicine or biology. Founding head Dr. Michael Repacholi is a physicist and former chief radiation scientist at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Here's the BBC exposing his financial links with the wireless industry in a 2009 documentary: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4qsC4tWkPQ> **Note former Head of UK's Health Protection Agency Sir (Professor) William Stewart admitting that the WHO EMF Project has got it wrong!** (between 5 -7 min on the video).
  - b. Current head, Dr. Repacholi's successor, Dr. Emilie Van Deventer is an electrical engineer with industry conflicts of interest. This is how she responded to a media question about a large number of scientists petitioning against the negligence of EMR adverse effects by the unit that she runs: <https://vimeo.com/170983540> However, she has not acted to include scientific studies that her team has missed in the WHO reviews so far.
  - c. EMF Project at WHO receives funds from the industry. From Australia, ACMA collects \$1 M levy from the wireless industry in Australia each year and US \$50,000 of the \$300,000 collected by ARPANSA is reported to go the WHO's EMF Project (remaining \$700,000 goes to the NHMRC for research on health effects of EMR). Details at: [http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Senate/Environment\\_and\\_Communications/Completed\\_inquiries/1999-02/emr/report/c03#c03f16](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Environment_and_Communications/Completed_inquiries/1999-02/emr/report/c03#c03f16)
  - d. This complaint by former head of Finland's national radiation biology lab on the failure at the WHO: <https://betweenrockandhardplace.wordpress.com/2015/02/15/handling-an-inquiry-the-who-style/>
  - e. This complaint by an eminent Swedish professor of medicine (oncologist) who's group has done the most extensive research on mobile/cordless phone use and brain tumours, published in the International Journal of Oncology ([Hardell L. 2017; 51: 405-13](#)).
2. **International Agency for Research on Cancer** - appointed an expert panel of 30 in 2011 to assess the cancer causing potential of wireless radiation (radiofrequency/microwave EMR). This panel wasn't entirely neutral either with staunch proponents of the industry. In fact, the WHO was compelled to step down previously appointed head of this panel Prof. Anders Ahlbom after protests came revealing his close financial links to mobile phone industry: <http://ollejohansson.adante.se/Anders-Ahlbom-IARC-2011-May.pdf> Though there were still gaps and clear errors in the review, the IARC panel concluded that RF/MW-EMR is a **2B possible human carcinogen** – this WHO classification applies to RF radiation from any wireless device, not just mobile phones as frequently misquoted. However, with the new scientific evidence made available after 2011, this classification warrants an upgrade to a Class 1 carcinogen (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28401165>)

## **Why We Cannot Rely on the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)**

Australian Radiation Protection & Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA) has largely relied on the International EMF Project, an industry-friendly NGO professional body ICNIRP (also founded by Prof. Repacholi and associates) and a few Australian researchers who have reviewed scientific literature on RF-EMR for ARPANSA (astonishingly, none with academic qualification in medicine or biological sciences!). **Their review of the scientific literature to assess risks to public health has been demonstrated to be flawed by scientists at ORSAA** (Leach V. and Weller, S. Radio Frequency Exposure Risk Assessment and Communication, Critique of ARPANSA TR-164 Report. Do we have a problem? Radiation Protection In Australasia (Journal of the Australasian Radiation Protection Society), Nov 2017; 34 (2): 9-18.