



Dear Drs. Baan, Straif, and Gaudin,

The UK Radiation Research Trust formally gives notice objecting to the World Health Organisations misrepresentation of the IARC 2B classification of RF/EMF.

In addition, members of the Radiation Research Trust are shocked to hear that the WHO website is ridiculing people who suffer with EHS by suggesting that these symptoms may be due to pre-existing psychiatric conditions as well as stress reactions as a result of worrying about EMF health effects. What sort of society are we living in when those in positions of power are ridiculing the most vulnerable in society?

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, birds, bees, worms, trees are all being affected. Could the animal kingdom and the environment also suffer from psychiatric conditions as well as stress reactions as a result of worrying about EMF health effects?

**The grounds of the objection on behalf of the UK Radiation Research Trust are:**

There is a very significant body of research published reinforcing the hypothesis that RF/EMF emissions are detrimental to health demonstrating that radiation exposures set within the current thermal ICNIRP guidelines can increase the probability of developing diseases following long term exposures, mainly cancer, tumours, and genetic damage. These are referred to as the stochastic effects of radiation, and are not included in the term radiation sickness. Stochastic effects often show up years after exposure. As the dose to an individual increases, the probability that cancer or a genetic effect will occur also increases.

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.

It is an infringement of human rights and possibly be in contravention of the Nuremberg treaty to subject unsuspecting members of the public to RF/EMF emissions when they have not been shown to be safe, and indeed much research and observation suggest that

there are significant risks, and when the public have clearly not given permission or approval or been given proper advice or words of caution to allow them to make informed decisions.

With all this in mind I respectfully request that the issues contained in this letter are taken on board and acted upon with regards to the WHO diluting the message given from the WHO website to the public.

I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

Eileen O'Connor

Director

EM Radiation Research Trust

<http://www.radiationresearch.org>