



Sent via email on 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2015

**Open letter - please distribute widely**

For the attention of members representing the European Economic and Social Committee TEN Section on electrosensitivity,

I am contacting you after receiving a copy of the opinion on Electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) report recently adopted by the EESC's TEN section.

English version of the Draft Opinion on Electromagnetic hypersensitivity, Brussels, 19 December, 2014:

[https://toad.eesc.europa.eu/ViewDoc.aspx?doc=ces%5cten%5cten559%5cES%5cEESC-2014-05117-00-00-PA-TRA\\_EN.doc&docid=3040363](https://toad.eesc.europa.eu/ViewDoc.aspx?doc=ces%5cten%5cten559%5cES%5cEESC-2014-05117-00-00-PA-TRA_EN.doc&docid=3040363)

English version Opinion on Electromagnetic hypersensitivity, Brussels, 13 January, 2015:

[https://toad.eesc.europa.eu/ViewDoc.aspx?doc=ces%5cten%5cten559%5cEN%5cEESC-2014-05117-00-01-AS-TRA\\_EN.doc&docid=3046232](https://toad.eesc.europa.eu/ViewDoc.aspx?doc=ces%5cten%5cten559%5cEN%5cEESC-2014-05117-00-01-AS-TRA_EN.doc&docid=3046232)

The reports main purpose is to protect people suffering with electrosensitivity and your important work will hopefully lead towards suggesting binding EU legislation on EMF. I am grateful to all members for allocating almost five hours towards this important debate on 7th January, 2015 and appreciate the voting has been close in the final text along in the voting on each of the amendments. I understand that the next plenary session is due to take place on 21st January, 2015 to finalise the report and therefore call on all members to review the evidence and information contained within this letter.

I am the founder and Director for the UK EM Radiation Research Trust. I am also founding member and Board member for the International EMF Alliance and member of the EU Commission Stakeholder Dialogue Group on EMF.

I can assure you that EHS is very real. It is a physiological condition, not a psychological one. Some studies have been published by psychologists who are not qualified to establish physiological causality, and funding from the telecommunications industry has also created a literature bias as evidenced in published figures by Henry Lai and Anke Huss.

The number of people suffering from EHS is increasing as the exposure to modern digital wireless technology increases at a fast rate. Wireless technology is currently being widely promoted and will greatly increase the number of pulsing RF sources close to people. Many homes, schools and offices now have DECT RF phone systems and WiFi. We believe that already the economic costs of people working less well due to EHS symptoms outweighs the apparent benefits of having everyone wirelessly connected. In most cases it is better, faster and certainly more secure to have properly Ethernet wired systems in homes and offices. The EESC should ensure that they are able to properly quantify these factors so that you can make a balanced judgment.

I am shocked to hear that UK EESC member Sir Richard Adams argued against the precautionary approach and apparently used denial arguments that are clearly modeled on telecommunications enterprise lobbies. I hear that Sir Richard Adams publicly announced his intention to meet with opponents to the report to develop alternative text for the next EESC plenary meeting on 21st January, 2015. This is in total contrast to his public image as the founder of several social enterprises that allow people to express ethical values with a focus on fair trade, the problems of social exclusion and sustainability and I am therefore struggling to believe that he would argue against supporting some of the most vulnerable people in society with regards to people suffering with electrosensitivity.

In addition Sir Richard Adams is known for encouraging public opinion. 'According to Sir Richard Adams, another EESC member who has drafted numerous opinions on nuclear energy, "the public must be positively engaged in open ended decision-making on nuclear energy related issues that have long term consequences." Please read the following text under section 23. <http://www.bne.eu/content/file/dispatch-pdf/2012-12-10/237c-11.pdf>

I have written to Sir Richard on 6th January, 2015 in the hope of providing supportive evidence for the meeting on 7th January and included a request to meet with him as his earliest convenience. I await his response.

I have no doubt that EESC members are honest and full of integrity, however, I am sure you will all agree that total transparency and openness is essential in decision making. EESC members voting on the lives and human rights of electrosensitive people have a duty of care and responsibility and should be called to report any conflicts of interest. It would be unfair to allow any member of the EESC to vote if influenced by primary or secondary interests which may affect professional judgment. Protection of public health is priority. I am therefore requesting a report highlighting any conflicts of interest of members under the freedom of information act and I encourage all citizens throughout Europe to engage with their Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament to call for a thorough and open investigation. I also call for a report detailing the reasons for deleting sections contained within the original report.

This issue is an emergency situation that could have far reaching impacts for society and the environment. Many people currently suffering with EHS feel abandoned due to the detrimental impacts to their health as a result of exposure to man-made radiation. RF radiation can adversely affect the immune system and the central and peripheral nervous systems, as well as the endocrine system, causing a host of conditions and diseases that make routine tasks in life such as going to school, work, the shop, and seeking medical care not only difficult but often impossible. For these people to face further ridicule due to the ignorance of some members in authority who wrongly believe that EHS is psychological is blatantly unjust. The telecommunications industry is pushing this message that EHS is a psychological condition, and they are paying scientists to generate science that gives an "all clear" to WiFi in some instances, and in other studies, to insist EHS is psychosomatic. Yet when these studies are closely examined, it becomes clear they have been skewed to come out with a predictable message that suits the industry's agenda. This is the time to establish sound policy to protect human rights. I am talking about the human rights of millions of people throughout the whole of Europe who are suffering with EHS today. To turn your backs on them would be inhumane. They have no voice. Most are housebound and cannot attend public forum meetings to voice their concerns.

I would like to highlight a very important quote from Professor Yuri Grigoriev, Honorary Chairman of Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection and Advisory Committee member of WHO on EMF and Health. Professor Grigoriev has also worked actively for the state governmental program on creation of nuclear protection since 1949. His expertise was called upon to help contain the Chernobyl disaster after accumulating 40 years experience before the failure in Chernobyl. I directly asked Professor Grigoriev a question with respect to comparing the severity of non-ionizing radiation compared to ionizing radiation. He said, "Ionizing radiation is monitored with safety systems in place to contain and control and prevent overexposure. The current proliferation of wireless frequencies is worse as levels of non-ionizing radiation are constantly increasing and ubiquitous; it is out of control. The world-wide dissemination of mobile telecommunications has resulted in new sources of large-scale population exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields. Prevention of childhood and juvenile diseases from exposure to EMF sources is of paramount social and economic importance. It is one of the bases for public health policy in the near and long-term future. The human brain and the nervous system tissues directly perceive EMF and react irrespective of its intensity, and in certain cases it depends on EMF modulation. This feature distinguishes EMF from all other environmental factors and complicates human health risk assessment for EMF exposure. A situation has emerged that cumulative EMF exposure of children may be comparable to adult exposure and may be equal to the levels of occupational exposure of workers. The current standards are outdated and inadequate. Urgent action is needed to curb the negative impact from this physical agent."

I hope you will listen to the voice of experts in this field such as Professor Yuri Grigoriev, independent doctors, scientists and to members of the public especially those who suffer with electrosensitivity as your decisions will carry long term consequences and I am therefore appealing with you to follow the precautionary approach. People suffering with EHS are sounding the warning bells for society and need to be taken seriously. Millions of European citizens are relying on officials for protection of their lives and freedom. There is a potential for discrimination to ignore human rights. Allowing the proliferation of technology to continue without any due care and attention will result in subjecting the public and the environment to long term irreversible consequences.

Many doctors and scientists worldwide believe there is a very real and significant risk to the general health of the public, wildlife and the environment. Including the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) an agency forming part of the World Health Organisation have categorised RF as a Group 2b carcinogen for the entire spectrum, some members of which are publicly vocal that the classification must be increased as rapidly as possible to Group 1.

Please find enclosed a recent document on Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity by Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe. This is the first draft working document with more sections to follow. The first 5 pages of the report are bullet points and we feel it essential in your decision making. The remaining pages are abstracts to corroborate her points.

<http://www.iemfa.org/wp-content/pdf/Mallery-Blythe-v1-EESC.pdf>

This document will site evidence supporting our claim that EHS is physiological and highlight literature which demonstrates the irrelevance of the nocebo effect. In particular we would like to draw your attention to the multitude of studies which show EHS symptom constellation in the general population manifesting in a dose response fashion from

exposure to RF emitting devices such as mobile phone base stations and telephones. This work cannot be ignored, as it is part of a growing body of evidence proving the existence of EHS. Additionally of course there are positive provocation studies which demonstrate that EMF exposure is instigating the symptoms.

Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe is the founder of PHIRE (Physicians' Health Initiative for Radiation and Environment), Trustee Radiation Research Trust (RRT), Medical Advisor ES-UK and Board Member CPTF. The following links are to presentations that she has given on use of RF in schools and also to the British Society of Ecological Medicine on EHS:

<https://www.vimeo.com/100623585> &  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNFdZVeXw7M>

I suggest calling on Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe to speak as an advocate and medical doctor to support the debate in favour of people suffering with EHS.

In addition please download the following paper by Professor Henry Lai and Blake Levitt:  
[http://www.magdahavas.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Blake\\_Levit-Henry\\_Lai.pdf](http://www.magdahavas.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Blake_Levit-Henry_Lai.pdf)

EHS is recognised in Sweden as a disability/functional impairment and the Government provides benefits directly to their handicap organization "Elöverkänsligas Riksförbund" for these victims to gain accessibility measures with benefits to shield their homes etc.

Furthermore, it is not just humans that are suffering from EMFs. Many animal studies have also shown biological effects. The effects of EMR are being felt by wildlife and the environment as a whole and many other species. The animal kingdom and the environment cannot be labeled as suffering from psychiatric conditions as well as stress reactions as a result of worrying about EMF health effects. Please review the following paper on functionality Disorders in Bees, Birds and Humans by Dr Ulrich Warnke, Biosciences, University of Saarland.

[http://archive.radiationresearch.org/conference/downloads/021500\\_warnke.pdf](http://archive.radiationresearch.org/conference/downloads/021500_warnke.pdf)

Finally, I would like to end with a quote from Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland, a medical doctor, former Prime Minister of Norway, former Director-General of the World Health Organization and now a member of the Elders – an independent group of global leaders brought together by Nelson Mandela. Professor Magda Havas directly asked Dr Gro Harlem Brundtland to respond to a question asking for her opinion saying “In this age of growing exposure to wireless technology and constantly increasing levels of exposure to radiofrequency radiation, what advice?” Dr Brundtland said: “This is important. We are exposed to different technologies of a new nature. I am frustrated that I was unable to sound the alarm fully. A sentence in an instruction book where you do not explain the danger of radiofrequency is not good public health and consumer policy. I became electrically sensitive and have been criticized because I can scare the public. We know they are not inert and there are potential consequences. People who have electrical sensitivity show that we do take some risk. Until we know more, we cannot say this is no problem.”

Download here: <http://www.magdahavas.com/gro-harlem-brundtland-talks-at-the-university-of-waterloo>

The number of people suffering from EHS is increasing as the exposure to wireless technology increases in all facets of home, school, business and commerce. There are costs beyond human suffering that must be considered by those in authority, and you have the power to attempt to control these costs and losses in the policy you are about to address. The medical costs for EHS and RF radiation-initiated diseases will overload an already burdened health care system. Additionally, there is an unquantifiable cost to society in terms of lost education and lost productivity. Every life is precious, but without doubt some of our best and brightest will fall through the cracks, unable to function in today's world unless EHS sufferers are fully recognised and accommodated.

With all this in mind I respectfully request that the issues contained in this letter are taken on board. I hope that you follow the precautionary approach and vote in favour to support the health and well-being of people suffering with EHS today and protect the health of future generations.

I have included Radiation Research Trust trustees and Patrons in this open letter along with other interested parties.

Yours faithfully,

Eileen O'Connor

Director

EM Radiation Research Trust

[www.radiationresearch.org](http://www.radiationresearch.org)