

## **One step closer towards gaining recognition for the rights of electromagnetic hypersensitivity throughout Europe**

The 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2015 will be remembered as the first step towards gaining recognition for electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) victims throughout Europe. One hundred and ten European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) members voted with their conscience after carrying out a full and thorough investigation into this serious issue. Sadly the votes of 110 EESC members were overruled by 136 EESC members who voted in favour of a controversial late counter-opinion submitted by EESC member Richard Adams who was later exposed as having serious conflicts of interests. The counter-opinion was adopted and calls for a sympathetic approach to EHS victims but claims the condition is psychological which adds further insult to injury. This reckless decision will allow further proliferation of mobile phones, dect phones, phone masts, WiFi, smart meters and the smart grid. We may have lost this battle, but it has taken us one step closer towards gaining recognition for the rights of millions of people suffering with electromagnetic hypersensitivity. Those in positions of power are gaining more knowledge of this issue adding power to the people and to the 110 EESC members who fought for truth and justice.

Campaigners throughout Europe led by Electrosensibles Derecho Salud called on the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) to support the original opinion report on electrohypersensitivity (EHS) led by EESC member Hernandez Bataller following a full investigation by a taskforce of EESC members. The original opinion called for protection of people suffering with EHS today and for preventative measures to be put in place to protect future generations. The original opinion was launched following a thorough investigation after reviewing evidence and meeting with doctors, scientists and hearing from EHS victims. UK EESC member Richard Adams OBE proceeded to lobby his colleagues to launch a counter-opinion report in support of his misguided views in favour of industry values without disclosing his own conflicts of interest. Mr. Adams was challenged over serious conflicts of interest during the EESC Plenary Session due to his stakeholder position with RWE AG, one of Europe's five leading electricity and gas companies along with his trustee position for the Charity Sustainability First. Both enterprises have a vested interest in Smart Grid and Smart Meters that rely on wireless radiofrequency technology.

Radiation Research Trust Director Eileen O'Connor said "I am shocked to hear that UK EESC member Richard Adams used denial arguments that are clearly modelled on telecommunications enterprise lobbies without disclosing his industry connections." O'Connor added, "This form of radiofrequency radiation poisoning of EHS victims can 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 and marginalises these people even further by treating them as outcasts in society, it is brutality at its worse. Protection towards public health and especially of those with no voice such as EHS victims and children is an absolute priority."

One hundred and thirty six members representing the European Economic and Social Committee TEN Section voted to turn their backs on EHS victims based on industry friendly science and biased opinions, allowing the continuing onslaught of ever increasing levels of pulsed radiofrequency microwave radiation to blanket the planet while ignoring the human rights and plight of people suffering in pain and often in isolation from this debilitating condition.

It is estimated that 3% to 5% of the population is suffering from EHS and the numbers are growing. People are often misdiagnosed as the medical profession is not trained to recognise the symptoms associated with EHS, leading to inappropriate treatments for such conditions as tinnitus, headaches, dizzy spells, cardiac arrhythmia, sleep disorders, depression, shocks and burning sensations, and skin rashes. As a result, medications are often prescribed when the most important advice a patient can be given is to avoid RF radiation emitting devices and environments. Children are most at risk as they will absorb a higher dose of radiation and will be exposed throughout their lifetime. Significantly, 110 EESC members argued against the adoption of the counter-opinion and voted with their conscience in favour of protecting the vulnerable and preventing more harm.

Eileen O'Connor, Director for the UK Radiation Research Trust (RRT), led the UK campaign to alert Richard Adams and UK EESC members, providing research, information and called on the BioInitiative Working Group, consisting of 29 authors from ten countries; ten holding medical degrees (MDs) and 21 PhDs. This team of independent experts offers an alternative review to the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR). The BioInitiative Working Group have reviewed over 5000 peer reviewed scientific papers and highlights the fact that bioeffects are clearly established to occur with very low exposure levels of (non-thermal levels) to electromagnetic fields and radiofrequency radiation exposures. The report calls for the precautionary approach and urgent action due to chronic EMF-related diseases that are a potential risk for everyone. These diseases include adverse effects on the central nervous system, cancer initiating and promoting effects, impairments of certain brain functions, loss of memory and cognitive function and infertility and immune dysfunction. This report was completely dismissed by Richard Adams as having no value as he continues to rely on the forthcoming report by SCENIHR despite that fact that the RRT highlighted conflicts of interest within the SCENIHR scientific working group.

Other world leading experts offered supportive information for the RRT in an attempt to educate all UK EESC members and to alert them to the truth in science in support for those suffering with EHS. She drew their attention to a recent paper on Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity by RRT Trustee, Emergency Medicine Doctor Erica Mallery-Blythe. This report highlights a multitude of studies which show the 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 mobile and dect cordless phones. The RRT called for this large body of evidence on EHS to be taken into account by Richard Adams and all EESC members.

The report includes details for the work of Dr. Dominique Belpomme; a professor of oncology at Paris-Descartes University who is also President of the French Association for Research in Therapeutics Against Cancer. Dr. Dominique Belpomme has developed a diagnostic method based on blood tests and a special brain scan (pulsed Doppler echography) to visualize blood flow. "These patients clearly have vascular disorders in the brain, said the oncologist. In addition, our biological tests show that 30% of them have high levels of histamine, 50% have too much stress proteins, most have low levels of melatonin

(an potent anti-cancer hormone), and 30% have levels of antibodies and proteins that are tell-tale signs of thermal shock and brain damage.” This would clearly suggest that for EHS sufferers who have gone through the myriad tests offered by Dr. Belpomme, a psychosomatic claim is invalid.

Dr. Erica Mallery-Blythe states, "EHS is a physiological condition, not a psychological one. Any psychological features are a product of un-managed physiological disruption, sociological abandonment and in some cases, persecution. They are a justifiable result, not a cause. This is clear to medical doctors who see and help manage patients with EHS, but their voices are not being heard in this arena where non-medical personnel with no direct experience of the condition are dominant. Despite this bias against a medically and socially appropriate decision I am heartened to see that there was non-the-less a 45% vote in favour of more appropriate protection of those with EHS. This is a clear sign of the compelling credibility, importance and momentum of the movement for protection and I have no doubt that time and evidence will strengthen this group. Current literature on EHS is sparse, poor in design and also subject to industry bias, but again, despite this there is more than enough peer reviewed scientific literature to make clear the physiological nature of the condition and need for protection. Specifically I would highlight the vast numbers of papers documenting the EHS symptom constellation in the general population in a dose response fashion resulting from exposure to mobile phone base stations, and mobile telephones amongst other RF sources. The alarming facts that we are seeing EHS symptoms like this so prevalent in the general population should be a warning of preventable, impending public health disaster. This evidence cannot be ignored and appropriate protection of vulnerable groups such as those with EHS and children is an emergency."

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. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the cancer committee for the World Health Organisation, voted in May 2011 to categorise RF radiation as a Group 2b “possible human carcinogen” for the entire spectrum, which includes mobile phones, masts, dect phones, WiFi, smart meters and baby monitors. Dr. Lennart Hardell, an oncologist and epidemiologist as well as a scientist and member of IARC, produced the science which served as half the basis for IARC’s classification of RF radiation as a 2b carcinogen in a nearly unanimous vote. Subsequent to the IARC classification in 2011, Dr. Hardell has continued to produce some of the world’s best epidemiological studies on mobile phones, dect phones and the connection with brain tumours. More recent studies are even more definitive with respect to the connection between mobile phones and gliomas – the deadliest of brain tumours – and acoustic neuromas which are usually benign tumours of the auditory nerve. As a result of these more recent studies, Dr. Hardell is calling for an urgent reclassification of RF radiation from a “possible human carcinogen” to a Group 1 or a “known human carcinogen”, placing RF radiation in the same category as tobacco and asbestos. Dr Hardell’s science was also amazingly rejected by Richard Adams. Hardell provided a rebuttal letter along with further material in defence of his professional reputation and included a letter from a member of SCENIHR, Kjell Hansson Mild, PHD which clearly demonstrates the fact that SCENIHR tried to omit the most recent Hardell 2014 papers from their latest review.

Eileen O’Connor called for support from Professor Yuri Grigoriev, Honorary Chairman of the Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection and Advisory Committee member of WHO on EMF and Health. His expertise was called upon to help contain the Chernobyl disaster after accumulating 40 years experience before the failure in Chernobyl. When asked to compare the severity of non-ionizing radiation (mobile phones, masts, WiFi) to ionizing radiation (nuclear, x-rays), Yuri Grigoriev 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”.

Grigoriev continued, focusing on his primary concern for which he calls for urgent action, “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.”

RRT advisor Susan Foster ended by saying, “Having listened to the debate, pro and con, in the EESC, it is clear both sides need to be educated about the impact of RF on the human body. I have followed firefighters in California who have had cell towers [masts] on their fire stations. When the radiation is beamed across the fire stations, these men and women are becoming ill with the following symptoms: headache, sleep disturbances, tinnitus, forgetfulness, inability to focus, mood swings, unexplained outbursts of anger and slowed reaction time. We have confirmed many of these symptoms through the use of SPECT brain scans and T.O.V.A. testing. For the EESC counter-opinion to suggest EHS symptoms are psychosomatic is an affront to somewhere between 22,000,000 and 37,000,000 EHS sufferers throughout Europe, and a similar number in the US.

Foster continued, “As I understand it, the industry supporters want to say ‘It’s all in the head of the sufferer. They are symptomatic because they read about or heard about concern that mobiles may cause health problems, and as a result they are now suffering these mysterious symptoms.’ To that I would ask Richard Adams and his colleagues to simply consider the firefighters. These men and women are fearless. They go into burning buildings at the risk of their own lives to rescue perfect strangers. Does Mr. Adams wish to tell the firefighters they are suffering from fear that the masts outside their stations might cause harm? This sort of reasoning is illogical and harmful to all but those industries that make money from wireless products. And the harm is only increasing with WiFi throughout schools and workplaces. Those patients with EHS are being isolated from society, not through choice, but because of lack of accommodation. This is inhumane, and leaders throughout Europe, as well as leaders in countries around the world, need to wake up. When we forsake human life for the sake of commerce, something has gone terribly wrong with society.”

The Radiation Research Trust is calling for urgent policy changes based on independent science to protect human rights of millions of EHS people throughout Europe. Members at the EESC should be stripped of their rights to vote on public policy if influenced by conflicts of interest. Furthermore, members of the EESC should not rely on the SCENIHR report for its conclusions with respect to the safety, or lack thereof, of RF radiation and EMFs in general. Scientists who are assigned the task of reporting on the safety of existing exposure limits of RF/EMF have a fiduciary duty to the public to not be persuaded by outside financial interests or affiliations that give these scientists the appearance of bias. As such the SCENIHR report’s conclusions are meaningless due to the omission of research that goes

against industry opinion and the declared conflicts of interest among a number of members within the SCENIHR external scientific committee.

Awareness is growing and the UK Radiation Research Trust congratulate the 110 EESC members who took the first step towards their duty of care voting for the original opinion which supported the human rights of EHS people as presented to the EESC by Dr Isaac Jamieson in the call for support for the right to life, prohibition of torture and prohibition of discrimination as required to be part of all policy making. The Radiation Research Trust call on all members to listen to independent scientists and medical doctors with expertise in this area of concern and remind policy makers of their duty of care to protect those fundamental principles and basic human values.

Download the timeline of letters and reports here:

<http://www.radiationresearch.org/progress-report-on-build-up-to-eesc-plenary-session-on-21st-and-22nd-january>



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

The EM Radiation Research Trust is an educational organisation funded by donations. An independent Charity Registered No. 1106304 © The EM Radiation Research Trust 2003-2004