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Introduction:

1. Quick overview of safety standard deficits
2. Vulnerable groups
3. Acute + Chronic Health Effects
4. Public health significance
5. Characterisation / definitions
6. Research inadequacies
7. Litigation and mitigation
8. Requirement for biological safety limits
Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G

Abstract
In the late-1990s, the FCC and ICNIRP adopted radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposure limits to protect the public and workers from adverse effects of RFR. These limits were based on results from behavioral studies conducted in the 1980s involving 40-60-minute exposures in 5 monkeys and 8 rats, and then applying arbitrary safety factors to an apparent threshold specific absorption rate (SAR) of 4 W/kg. The limits were also based on two major assumptions: any biological effects were due to excessive tissue heating and no effects would occur below the putative threshold SAR, as well as twelve assumptions that were not specified by either the FCC or ICNIRP. In this paper, we show how the past 25 years of extensive research on RFR demonstrates that the assumptions underlying the FCC’s and ICNIRP’s exposure limits are invalid and continue to present a public health harm. Adverse effects observed at exposures below the assumed threshold SAR include non-thermal induction of reactive oxygen species, DNA damage, cardiomyopathy, carcinogenicity, sperm damage, and neurological effects, including electromagnetic hypersensitivity. Also, multiple human studies have found statistically significant associations between RFR exposure and increased brain and thyroid cancer risk. Yet, in 2020, and in light of the body of evidence reviewed in this article, the FCC and ICNIRP reaffirmed the same limits that were established in the 1990s. Consequently, these exposure limits, which are based on false suppositions, do not adequately protect workers, children, hypersensitive individuals, and the general population from short-term or long-term RFR exposures. Thus, urgently needed are health protective exposure limits for humans and
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FACT SHEET

Scientific Evidence Invalidates Health Assumptions of Government Exposure Limits for Radiofrequency Radiation (RFR): Implications for 5G

ICBE-EMF
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS
Summary: 14 Flawed Assumptions

FCC/ICNIRP FALSELY CLAIM
- SAR 4 W/kg Heating Effect No Effect Possible
- Acute experiments can predict Chronic effects.
- No increase in brain tumors & studies biased
- Same Absorption
- Same Sensitivity To RFR

FCC/ICNIRP IGNORE
- Synergistic effects with RFR & other environmental agents
- Ignored

FCC/ICNIRP IR is WRONG MODEL for NIR
- Indirect ROS NIR
- Direct DNA damage IR

FCC/ICNIRP ARBITRARY SAFETY FACTORS
- Whole Body SAR 4W/kg HARMFUL 50-fold safe
- Localized 10 g tissue 2 W/kg 1 g tissue 1.6 W/kg
- Safe

FCC/ICNIRP arbitrary
- 5G Untested YET Safe
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Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G, Oct 2022

– Assumption 7)
  • Absorption Susceptibility in Children

– Assumption 8)
  • Differences in Sensitivity
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The ‘grayscale’ of damage from environmental toxicants

Biological damage → Acute illness → Chronic illness
The ‘grayscale’ of damage from environmental toxicants

Biological Effects  ➔  Acute illness  ➔  Chronic illness
ICNIRP 2002

• Variations in tolerance
  – Children
  – Elderly
  – Chronically ill people
ICNIRP 2002 (cont)

• Separate guidelines needed?

• All encompassing guidelines?

• Anticipation of failure where there are:
  – Concomitant exposures
  – Underlying health complaints which elevate sensitivity
ICNIRP Factsheet 2020:

• “...exposure values from adults have been used to set the restrictions”

• “...restrictions have not been set to separately account for EHS.”
WRONG ASSUMPTION 8)
No differences in absorption of RF-EMF and susceptibility to this radiation.
“body core temperature in response to whole body exposure increases more in adults than in children, and so the exposure values from adults have been used to set the restrictions”
2-fold brain
10-fold bone marrow
5-fold eyes
30-fold hippocampus
RF absorption by child vs. adult
Mild to Moderate EHS is likely to affect at least 10-20% of the population:
- USA: 12.8-32.1 million
- UK: 2.5-6.3 million
- Europe: 29.6 to 74 million


How mobil phone radiation penetrates the brain

5 year old
Absorption rate: 4,49W/kg

10 year old
Absorption rate: 3,21W/kg

Adult
Absorption rate: 2,93W/kg

For a absorption rate of 2,93 W/kg of power absorptive by an adult: This same power will produce a absorption rate of 3,21 W/kg for a 10 year old child and absorption rate of 4,49 W/Kg for a 5 year old child.

www.next-up.org
It is not simply about ‘core body temperature’

- Local Exposures (NT Effects)
  - Anatomy
  - Tissue dielectrics
  - Physiology
Wireless technologies, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and children: Identifying and reducing health risks

Devra Davis, PhD, MPH, Linda Birnbaum, PhD, Paul Ben-Ishai, PhD, Hugh Taylor, MD, Meg Sears, MEng, PhD, Tom Butler, PhD, MSc, and Theodora Scarato, MSW

Children today are conceived and live in a sea of wireless radiation that did not exist when their parents were born. The launch of the digital age continues to transform the capacity to respond to emergencies and extend global communications. At the same time that this increasingly ubiquitous technology continues to alter the nature of commerce, medicine, transport and modern life overall, its varied and changing forms have not been evaluated for their biological or environmental impacts. Standards for evaluating radiation from numerous wireless devices were first set in 1996 to avoid heating tissue and remain unchanged since then in the US and many other nations. A wide range of evidence indicates that there are numerous non-thermal effects from wireless radiation on reproduction, development, and chronic illness. Many widely used devices such as phones and tablets function as two-way microwave radios, sending and receiving various frequencies of information-carrying microwave radiation on multiple simultaneously operating antennas. Expert groups advising governments on this matter do not agree on the best approaches to be taken. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends limited screen time for children under the age of two, but more than half of all toddlers regularly have contact with screens, often without parental engagement. Young children of parents who frequently use devices as a form of childcare can experience delays in speech acquisition and bonding, while older children report feelings of disappointment due to ‘technoference’—parental distraction due to technology. Children who begin using devices early in life can become socially, psychologically and physically addicted to the technology and experience withdrawal upon cessation. We review relevant experimental, epidemiological and clinical evidence on biological and other impacts of currently used wireless technology, including advice to include key questions at pediatric wellness checkups from infancy to young adulthood. We conclude that consistent with advice in pediatric radiology, an approach that recommends that microwave radiation exposures be As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) seems sensible and prudent, and that an independently-funded training, research and monitoring program should be carried out on the long term physical and psychological impacts of rapidly changing technological milieu, including ways to mitigate impacts through modifications in hardware and software. Current knowledge of electrosensitivity indicates the importance of reducing wireless exposures especially in schools and health care settings.

Curr Probl Pediatr Adolesc Health Care 2023; 000:101374
WRONG ASSUMPTION 8:
NO DIFFERENCES IN SENSITIVITY
ACUTE EFFECTS OF NIR
EESC European Economic and Social Committee (2019). Digitalisation – Challenges of Europe:

3% - 5% of European population

i.e. 37.4 million Europeans in 2020
Common EHS Triggers
ELECTROMAGNETIC HYPERSENSITIVITY (EHS)
Electromagnetic hypersensitivity: proceedings

International Workshop on Electromagnetic Field Hypersensitivity, Prague, Czech Republic, October 25-27, 2004

13 May 2006 | Report

Overview

A WHO workshop on Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity was held in Prague on October 25-27, 2004. This meeting was arranged in collaboration with the National Reference Laboratory for Non-Ionizing Radiation, Ministry of Health, Czech Republic and was cosponsored by the European Commission Coordinated Action EMF-NET and the Action COST 281 (Potential Health Implications from Mobile Communication Systems) within the European Framework for Cooperation in the Field of Scientific and Technical Research.

Sensitivity to EMF has been given the general name “Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity” or EHS. It comprises nervous system symptoms like headache, fatigue, stress, sleep disturbances, skin symptoms like prickling, burning sensations and rashes, pain and ache in muscles and many other health problems. Whatever its cause, EHS is a real and sometimes a disabling problem for the affected persons. Their EMF exposure is generally several orders of magnitude under the limits of internationally accepted standards. The aim of the conference was to review the current state of knowledge and opinions of the conference participants and propose ways forward on this issue.

The meeting was conducted by the WHO International EMF Project as part of the scientific review process to determine biological and health effects from exposure to EMF. The
Sensitivity to EMF has been given the general name “Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity” or EHS. It comprises nervous system symptoms like headache, fatigue, stress, sleep disturbances, skin symptoms like prickling, burning sensations and rashes, pain and ache in muscles and many other health problems. Whatever its cause, EHS is a real and sometimes a disabling problem for the affected persons. Their EMF exposure is generally several orders of magnitude under the limits of internationally accepted standards.
Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity

Is it caused by non-ionising EMR exposure?

ICNIRP suggest it is caused by the “Nocebo Response”
Physical symptoms created by psychological negative expectation (fear) – plausible?
The Importance of Temporality

If ‘A’ causes ‘B’, then A must precede B

• BUT, symptoms have been repeatedly shown to develop before concerns of health effects.
Does Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity Originate from Nocebo Responses? Indications from a Qualitative Study

Maël Dieudonné*
Centre Max Weber and Université Lumière–Lyon 2, Lyon, France

Idiopathic Environmental Intolerance attributed to Electromagnetic Fields (IEI-EMF) is a condition in which symptoms are attributed to electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure. As electro-hypersensitive (EHS) people have repeatedly been observed, during provocation trials, to report symptoms following perceived rather than actual exposure, the hypothesis has been put forward that IEI-EMF originates from psychological mechanisms, especially nocebo responses. This paper examines this hypothesis, using data from a qualitative study aimed at understanding how EHS people come to regard themselves as such. Forty self-diagnosed EHS people were interviewed. A typified model of their attribution process was then elaborated, inductively, from their narratives. This model is linear and composed of seven stages: (1) onset of symptoms; (2) failure to find a solution; (3) discovery of EHS; (4) gathering of information about EHS; (5) implicit appearance of conviction; (6) experimentation; (7) conscious acceptance of conviction. Overall, symptoms appear before subjects start questioning effects of EMF on their health, which is not consistent with the hypothesis that IEI-EMF originates from nocebo responses to perceived EMF exposure. However, such responses might occur at the sixth stage of the process, potentially reinforcing the attribution. It remains possible that some cases of IEI-EMF originate from other psychological mechanisms.


Key words: idiopathic environmental intolerance; IEI-EMF; illness narratives; attribution process; causal reasoning
Temporality Falsifies the Nocebo Response

This model is linear and composed of seven stages: (1) onset of symptoms; (2) failure to find a solution; (3) discovery of EHS; (4) gathering of information about EHS; (5) implicit appearance of conviction; (6) experimentation; (7) conscious acceptance of conviction. Overall, symptoms appear before subjects start questioning effects of EMF on their health, which is not consistent with the hypothesis that IEI-EMF originates from nocebo responses to perceived EMF exposure. However, such responses might occur at the sixth stage of the process, potentially reinforcing the attribution. It remains possible that some cases of IEI-EMF originate from other psychological mechanisms.
Those who claim EHS is not caused by EMF:

• Rely on 2 principles:

  1. Claimed absence of low intensity effects (‘non-thermal’)

  2. Negative outcome EMF provocation studies
Relevant Biological and Health Effects
Proven, EHS symptoms are caused by NIR Exposure

73% of RF Studies Show Neurological Effects
Lai 2022 Bioinitiative Report

95% Show Oxidative Stress (linked with EHS via biomarkers)
ICBE 2022, Env Health

Consistency: Neurological Effects

Coherence: Oxidative Stress (95%) positive findings

Effect 244/336
No Effect 92/ 336

Effect 124/131
No Effect (7/131)
Those who claim EHS is not caused by EMF:

- Rely on 2 principles:
  1. Claimed absence of low intensity effects (‘non-thermal’)
  2. Negative outcome EMF provocation studies
PROVOCATION STUDIES
Human ‘EMF provocations’ have taken many forms…
... Have been going for a long while
Safeguard young people's well-being by implementing measures to reduce exposure to mobile phones. Although some symptoms, such as headaches, irritability, and depression, are strongly associated with exposure, the direct link between exposure and sleep disturbance is not always evident. In general, exposure to the continuous wave signal increases the risk of headaches in all groups, regardless of exposure level. However, adjusting for multiple comparisons revealed a significant association only in the group exposed to frequencies between 1.8 and 3.0 GHz.

CONCLUSIONS:
A questionnaire was used as a study tool. The results of the questionnaire survey reveal that students residing closer to base stations have a higher prevalence of symptoms compared to those living further away. The prevalence of symptoms is higher among subjects residing at less than 300 m from base stations. For seven symptoms, the adjusted OR is 0.7 (CI 0.4-0.8) for those living closer to the base station compared to those living more than 300 m away. For other symptoms, the adjusted OR is 0.7 (CI 0.2-2.4) for those living closer to the base station compared to those living further away. No significant change in sleep quality or melatonin excretion was observed after the system was shutdown. The authors concluded that the results of the studies give evidence for a health risk from mobile phone base stations, particularly for children and adolescents.

Epidemiological evidence for a health risk from mobile phone base stations.

EHS GENERAL POPULATION SYMPTOMS
- Fatigue
- Headache
- Sleep disturbances
- Feeling of discomfort
- Depression
- Irritability
- Lowering of libido

Neurobehavioral symptoms or cancer in populations living at distances < 500 m from base stations.

Increased duration of mobile phone use is associated with lower perceived health and symptoms such as headaches, sleep disturbances, feeling of discomfort, and depression. The symptoms reported in the literature as "Microwave Syndrome" are in line with the symptoms reported in the current study. The authors concluded that the results of the studies give evidence for a health risk from mobile phone base stations, particularly for children and adolescents.

Neurobehavioral effects among inhabitants around mobile phone base stations.

Association between mobile phone use and depressed mood in Japanese school children.
Methodological Flaws in EMF Provocation Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation phase:</th>
<th>Exposure provocation phase:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Selection of participants</td>
<td>• Trigger frequencies used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate exclusions</td>
<td>• Trigger intensities used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trigger frequencies identification</td>
<td>• Onset time correctly encompassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trigger intensities identification</td>
<td>• Offset + Washout encompassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Onset of symptom identification</td>
<td>• Cumulative symptoms prevented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offset of symptoms identification</td>
<td>• ‘Sham’ exposures zero EMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other triggers identification</td>
<td>• ‘Real’ exposure profiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification reliability</td>
<td>• Control for interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification symptom contrast</td>
<td>• Attrition Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Washout all symptoms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EMF background hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chemical / other sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double / Triple Blinded Protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post study analysis phase:
- Appropriate data analysis
- Appropriate outcome reporting

• Imprecision
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Methodological Flaws in EMF Provocation Studies

Preparation phase:
- Selection of participants
- Appropriate exclusions
- Trigger frequencies identification
- Trigger intensities identification
- Onset of symptom identification
- Offset of symptoms identification
- Other triggers identification
- Identification reliability
- Identification symptom contrast
- Washout all symptoms
- EMF background hygiene
- Chemical / other sanitation
- Double / Triple Blinded Protocol
- Major ethical questions

Exposure provocation phase:
- Trigger frequencies used
- Trigger intensities used
- Onset time correctly encompassed
- Offset + Washout encompassed
- Cumulative symptoms prevented
- ‘Sham’ exposures zero EMF
- ‘Real’ exposure profiles.
- Control for interference
- Attrition Effects

Post study analysis phase:
- Appropriate data analysis
- Appropriate outcome reporting
- Imprecision
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Experiment Falsifies the Nocebo Response

Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity: Evidence for a Novel Neurological Syndrome

DOI: 10.3109/00207454.2011.608139

David E. McCarty, Simona Carrubba, Andrew L. Chesson Jr., Clifton Frilot II, Eduardo Gonzalez-Toledo & Andrew A. Marino

Published online: 05 Sep 2011

FIGURE 1. Spatial distribution of the external electric field (E) in the mid-sagittal plane. E was generated by applying VAC = 100 volts to parallel metal plates while the subject was electrically isolated (insert), and calculated at all points in the subject’s environment. Average E surrounding the head was about 300 V/m.
Experiment Falsifies the Nocebo Response

Discussion: The subject demonstrated statistically reliable somatic reactions in response to exposure to subliminal EMFs under conditions that reasonably excluded a causative role for psychological processes. Conclusion: EMF hypersensitivity can occur as a bona fide environmentally inducible neurological syndrome.
Those who claim EHS is not caused by EMF:

• Rely on 2 principles:

1. **Claimed absence of low intensity effects**
   (‘non-thermal’)

2. Negative outcome EMF provocation studies
Those who claim EHS is not caused by EMF:

• Rely on 2 principles:

1. Claimed absence of low intensity effects ('non-thermal')

2. Negative outcome EMF provocation studies
Admissions from ICNIRP 2020

• it is not always easy to draw a clear distinction between biological and adverse health effects, and indeed this can vary depending on individual susceptibility to specific situations.”
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Further mistakes from ICNIRP 2020

Biological Effects ➔ Health Effects
Further mistakes from ICNIRP 2020

Biological Effects

Health Effects
Not Classified as “Health Effects”:

- **Tingling sensation** from electric or magnetic fields;
- **Light flickering** from stimulation of the retina
- **Microwave hearing** from expansion of soft tissues

“Such perceptions may sometimes lead to discomfort and annoyance. “

“The exposure circumstances under which discomfort and annoyance occur vary between individuals.”
In reality...

- Symptoms signify substantial biological disruption.

- EHS people don’t experience merely ‘discomfort’

They can experience severe pain and broad ranging, disabling symptoms (as noted by WHO – 2005)
Global Successful Legal Actions Regarding EHS

• **UK** - EHS Child won EHCP for EHS awarding mandatory low EMF school accommodations: Education Health Care Plan (EHCP) awarded (Aug 2022) for UK child on the basis of Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS). – Phire Medical

• **UK** - Social Worker receives early pension and ESA for EHS: ‘Early ill-health retirement and Employment Support Allowance awarded on the basis of Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS) – Further detailed Press Release’ – Phire Medical

• **Australia** – Scientist awarded 75% of his salary as compensation: [http://www8.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/cth/aat/2013/105.html](http://www8.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/cth/aat/2013/105.html)

CHRONIC HEALTH EFFECTS
2. Since 2002, multiple robust epidemiologic studies of cell phone radiation\textsuperscript{2} have found increased risks for brain tumors which are supported by evidence of carcinogenicity of the same cell types (glial cells and Schwann cells) from animal studies.\textsuperscript{4,5}
The EU Funded ‘Reflex Study’
Evidence of Damage from EMF

DNA Breakage

| Sham                          | Gamma-irradiation, 0.5 Gy (1,600 chest x-rays) | 24 h mobile phone, RF-EMF, 1800 MHz at SAR = 1.3 W/kg. ICNIRP/WHO = 2 W/kg |

PRESS RELEASE
Nº 208

31 May 2011

IARC CLASSIFIES RADIOFREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS AS POSSIBLY CARCINOGENIC TO HUMANS

Lyon, France, May 31, 2011 -- The WHO/International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B), based on an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer\(^1\), associated with wireless phone use.
NTP Technical Report on the Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies in Sprague Dawley (Hsd:Sprague Dawley® SD®) Rats Exposed to Whole-body Radio Frequency Radiation at a Frequency (900 MHz) and Modulations (GSM and CDMA) Used by Cell Phones

NTP TR 595

November 2018
## Peer-Review of NTP

Table thanks to: Joel M. Moskowitz, PhD, School of Public Health, UC Berkeley, March 30, 2018

Electromagnetic Radiation Safety: Evidence of Carcinogenicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Modulation</th>
<th>Tumor</th>
<th>NTP Draft Report</th>
<th>Expert Panel (vote)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Heart: Schwannoma</td>
<td>some evidence.</td>
<td>clear evidence (8-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Heart: Schwannoma</td>
<td>some evidence</td>
<td>clear evidence (8-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Brain: Glioma</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>some evidence (7-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Brain: Glioma</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>some evidence (6-4-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Brain: Granular Cell</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Prostate gland</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Pituitary gland</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (10-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Pituitary gland</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Adrenal gland</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>some evidence (6-4-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Male</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Female</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Heart: Schwannoma</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>equivocal (9-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Female</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Heart: Schwannoma</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>equivocal (9-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Female</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Brain: Glioma</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (8-3)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Female</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Adrenal gland</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (10-0-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (8-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Male</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (11-0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Male</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (10-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Female</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (9-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Female</td>
<td>CDMA</td>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>equivocal</td>
<td>equivocal (9-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ramazzini Institute Study

Environmental Research
Volume 165, August 2018, Pages 496-503

Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission

Conclusions:

The RI findings on far field exposure to RFR are consistent with and reinforce the results of the NTP study on near field exposure, as both reported an increase in the incidence of tumors of the brain and heart in RFR-exposed Sprague-Dawley rats. These tumors are of the same histotype of those observed in some epidemiological studies on cell phone users. These experimental studies provide sufficient evidence to call for the re-evaluation of IARC conclusions regarding the carcinogenic potential of RFR in humans.
Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102)\textsuperscript{☆}

Anthony B. Miller\textsuperscript{a}*, L. Lloyd Morgan\textsuperscript{b}, Iris Udasin\textsuperscript{c}, Devra Lee Davis\textsuperscript{d,e}

\textsuperscript{a} Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Canada
\textsuperscript{b} Environmental Health Trust, Berkeley, CA, United States
\textsuperscript{c} Rutgers University School of Public Health, United States
\textsuperscript{d} Environmental Health Trust, Teton Village, WY, United States
\textsuperscript{e} Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
- Brain cancer
- Vestibular schwannoma
- Salivary gland tumor
- Electric hypersensitivity
- Glioma
- Meningioma
- Radio frequency fields
- Cell phones
- Mobile phones

ABSTRACT

Epidemiology studies (case-control, cohort, time trend and case studies) published since the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) 2011 categorization of radiofrequency radiation (RFR) from mobile phones and other wireless devices as a possible human carcinogen (Group 2B) are reviewed and summarized. Glioma is an important human cancer found to be associated with RFR in 9 case-control studies conducted in Sweden and France, as well as in some other countries. Increasing glioma incidence trends have been reported in the UK and other countries. Non-malignant endpoints linked include acoustic neuroma (vestibular Schwannoma) and meningioma. Because they allow more detailed consideration of exposure, case-control studies can be superior to cohort studies or other methods in evaluating potential risks for brain cancer. When considered with recent animal experimental evidence, the recent epidemiological studies strengthen and support the conclusion...
‘Remove, Replace, Reduce’
EESC European Economic and Social Committee (2019). Digitalisation – Challenges of Europe:

- Reinforce independence of bodies setting limits
- Binding safeguarding legislation reducing EMR
- Recognising this exposure as a cause of “functional disability and environmental illness.”
Summary

- Current guidelines fail to protect health
- Acute and chronic illness are associated
- Children have vulnerabilities which remain unaccounted for
- EHS is of major public health significance
- EHS symptoms are caused by anthropogenic NIR exposures
- Medical doctors need formalised educational training
- Medical Database Registry + specific ICD coding are required
- Management relies on avoidance of anthropogenic EMR
- Low EMR Zones (hospital + general public) are an emergency
- Moratorium on increased RF emissions is justified
- **Revised biological safety guidelines are urgently required**
Bernadino Ramazzini

"it is much better to prevent than to cure, and so much easier to foresee future harm and avoid it rather than have to get rid of it after having fallen prey"
Thank you so much for listening

Thank you to my colleagues at ICBE-EMF
and thank you to
Collegium Ramazzini