



18th January, 2015

Letter sent via email

Thank you for responding to my email and for reviewing the material enclosed.

I invited the BioInitiative Working Group to submit technical information on wireless health risks, please see attached. Also find attached letter defending their professional reputation and the value of the BioInitiative Report and Working Group.

You appear to have mistakenly used misguided and baseless arguments provided repeatedly by the telecommunications industry. I've no doubt that your accusations are unintentionally tort given the factual inaccuracy of your claims regarding the reputation of the Hardell Group and the BioInitiative Working Group.

On what basis do you contend the BioInitiative and Hardell Group science to have no academic or scientific support or credibility?

Your misguided criticism of Hardell cannot be supported, given that IARC, The World Health Organisation's esteemed cancer committee, concluded in May 2011 that RF – EMF is a 2B "possibly human" carcinogen. This decision was based on reviewing myriad studies but clearly biased science and inadequate science was dismissed, leaving IARC to use, as the basis for its decision, two studies - the Interphone Study and the epidemiology of Dr. Lennart Hardell. If Hardell's science is good enough for IARC, why is it considered to have no academic or scientific support or credibility?

The Italian Supreme Court, in October 2012, upheld a ruling that said there was a link between a business executive's brain tumour and his heavy mobile phone usage. The evidence was based on studies conducted by the Hardell Group between 2005-2009 (prior to his even stronger studies published in 2013 - 2014). The court said the research was independent and "unlike some others, was not co-financed by the same companies that produce mobile telephones". If Hardell's science is the only science good enough for the Italian Supreme Court, why is it considered to have no academic or scientific support or credibility?

Conflict of interest is of serious concern, especially for those in positions of power and influence. Time and time again we find the influence from industry creeping into the scientific arena. You may be interested to hear that the International Agency for Research on Cancer was forced to remove Anders Ahlom of the Karolinska Institute from its panel of experts just a week before they were about to evaluate the cancer risks posed by mobile phones. Ahlbom's conflict of interest was reported by a Swedish Journalist Mona Nilsson after she discovered that Ahlbom was a director for a consulting firm, Gunnar Ahlbom AB. The company was established to help clients on telecom issues, with an emphasis on environmental and energy regulations. The full report is available via Microwave News: <http://microwavenews.com/Ahlbom.html>
This needs to stop. Why are we relying on journalists, independent scientists and ordinary members of the public to alert policy makers to conflicts of interests within official groups such as IARC, WHO and SCENIHR.

We are concerned that you are providing an unbalanced opinion due to your reliance on industry funded experts, while dismissing a group of independent experts who have reviewed over 5000 peer reviewed published studies. You have made your position clear that you have no interest whatsoever in supporting any particular lobby or commercial organisation. I therefore question why you are providing information and reports that are representing interests of industry

lobbyists? See attached email on conflict of interests disclosure sent to you yesterday from Iris Atzmon. Were you previously aware of this before writing your counter opinion paper on electrohypersensitivity?

You responded to Iris Atzmon via email yesterday sending an industry funded article that dismisses the BioInitiative Report. This article was co-authored by an industry consultant and a billionaire who had made his money off the very technology you are dismissing as having an adverse health impact on citizens. Kenneth Foster is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and has been a paid industry consultant for decades; Lorne Trottier is a Canadian entrepreneur who has made his fortune in electronics and telecommunications. Trottier is a businessman without medical expertise, yet he has made it his mission to tell the world that people suffering from electrohypersensitivity are suffering from a psychosomatic condition. You offered an article by these two men as your basis for discrediting the esteemed BioInitiative Report. Ordinary members of the public and especially our children and those who are suffering with electrosensitivity are counting on you for fairness and caution in a world where citizens are becoming increasingly electrosensitive, we deserve far better than this, Mr. Adams. You have staunchly taken a very dangerous position that will affect every individual in Europe, a supposed 14,000,000 ES million of whom are already disabled to varying degrees by RF radiation. You relied on the opinion of Loren Trottier with respect to the BioInitiative Report, the man who funded 40 Canadian academics to write a letter to the media, telling that smart meters are safe. The truth is no non-industry funded study has proven that this technology is safe, including smart meters; reports continue to come in about EHS developing in residents following installations of smart meters on their homes in those countries where smart meters have been introduced. It appears your private investigation of this issue is influenced by external economic interests whether you are aware of it or not Trottier advances the smart meters. Why? Lorne Trottier is the owner of Matrox, a large manufacturer of Wifi-enabled motherboards and graphic chips for mobile internet devices. Trottier has set up multiple websites, including emfandhealth.com which serve to suppress the science pointing to the adverse effects of electromagnetic radiation.

My question to you is – are you promoting wireless smart meters, too? I read the EESC energy Opinion reports and understand and appreciate concerns for climate change and clean energy, but shouldn't the concern truly be as follows: How can we save energy and at the same time not threaten the health of citizens who are directly affected by energy conservation policies? The smart grid currently runs on a wireless system, this grid has been initiating EHS in many residents wherever it is installed, and the Precautionary Principle must be followed to avoid adding to the multi-millions of EHS citizens already unable to live in today's wireless world. Why the drive to install the 'smart grid,' forcing every home in the UK and throughout countries in Europe to use a wireless system, especially when there are safer options to follow? Please download a copy of the smart meter, smarter practices report by Dr Isaac Jamieson. My colleagues and I hand delivered a copy of this report to Number 10 Downing Street with Joe Benton MP and Bill Esterson MP. Download report here:

http://www.radiationresearch.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=173

As to the Hardell studies, I took SCENIHR on regarding their refusal to include the 2013 Hardell studies. I publicly challenged Dr. Schüz regarding the suppression of Hardell's five papers. I held up the five brilliant, omitted studies for all to see at the EU event in Athens last year and demanded to know why they were not included in the SCENIHR preliminary report. Dr. Schüz claimed that he had not seen them, yet I knew full well from Kjell Hansson Mild, a member of SCENIHR, that Joachim Schüz purposefully kept the 2013 compelling studies by Hardell out of the SCENIHR report; **among those five studies includes research in which Hardell calls for RF to be urgently upgraded to a Group 1 carcinogen which would put it in the same category as tobacco and asbestos.** The BioInitiative Working Group, Kjell Hansson Mild, and my colleague Susan Foster all demanded that the five Hardell Group papers needed to be included within the SCENIHR review; to omit and ignore them is to cater to industry wishes and ignore not only the elephant in the room, but also the health and wellbeing of over 500 million citizens. With the deceit I just described, the review carried out by SCENIHR is false. It is a whitewash and will not hold any value or weight with concerned citizens due to the industry ties connected to the group.

To further illustrate the depth of the conflict of interest that renders the SCENIHR report meaningless, please see the following declared conflicts of interest among the SCENIHR external committee:

- **Dr. Maria Rosaria Scarfi** declared connection to Telecom Italia and CTIA (wireless industry).
- **Dr. Olga Zeni** declared connection to Telecom Italia and CTIA.
- **Prof Mats-Olof Mattsson** declared connection to TeliaSonera, (Swedish mobile industry).
- **Prof. Anssi Auvinen** represents Finland in the COSMOS study. The Finnish part of COSMOS is funded by the Finnish Agency for Technology and Innovation (WIRECOM research program) and Yrjö Jahnesson foundation. The WIRECOM program received funding from Nokia, TeliaSonera and Elisa. He wrote in his declaration to SCENIHR, that he receives funding from the Mobile Manufacturers Forum.
- **Dr. Joachim Schüz** declared connection to Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), the US power industry research arm. Dr. Schüz is listed in an Austrian mobile phone advisory group that has received funding from the telecom companies. [http://www.wbf.or.at/wbf-expertenforum/expertenforum-2009/expertenliste/Wissenschaftlicher Beirat Funk: Expertenliste](http://www.wbf.or.at/wbf-expertenforum/expertenforum-2009/expertenliste/Wissenschaftlicher%20Beirat%20Funk-Expertenliste)

My final question is directed towards you under the Freedom of Information Act. I call for you to clearly state any first or secondary connections to the telecommunications industry as well as any and all utilities. I call on you to reveal any conflict of interest before using your influence to encourage your colleagues to vote on your counter Opinion on electrohypersensitivity which is based on industry values.

I've no doubt that you do not wish to commit yourself to an unsubstantiated and to a truly false position and therefore invite you to respond with an apology to Dr Lennart Hardell and the BioInitiative Working Group and offer them the respect they deserve along with an equal opportunity to voice concerns and present information and research to be included for review by the EESC rather than calling on a group of industry funded scientists to carry out the review.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen O'Connor
Director
EM Radiation Research Trust
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