

Dr Margaret Chan,
Director General,
World Health Organisation
chanm@who.int

7th December 2014

Dear Dr Chan,

The WHO's Environmental Health Criteria – Radio Frequency as regards Electromagnetic Sensitivity and Electromagnetic Hyper-Sensitivity

As you are doubtless aware, many people are deeply worried about the process, draft and conclusion already announced of the WHO's Environmental Health Criteria – Radio Frequency, partly published in draft on 1st October 2014 for comment.

It appears that, just as the WHO was infiltrated by tobacco scientists in the past, now it has been infiltrated by a clique of pro-wireless scientists. People with similar views include members of the ICNIRP, a private pro-radiation group spun out of the atomic weapons industry, and the EMF Project, which also tends to support the minority viewpoint still denying non-thermal effects.

Non-thermal effects, of course, have been convincingly established and admitted for over 50 years, including by the ICNIRP. It is absurd for the draft EHC to pretend that scientists can still deny them.

Sensitivity to electromagnetic exposure is now accepted by the majority of scientists. Sensitivity symptoms are accepted even in recent ICNIRP studies and by the IARC, and the reporting of physical symptoms is now legally required of employers in the European Union under the EC Directive 2013/35/EU. It is therefore absurd for the review to be based on a rejection of this majority viewpoint.

It is equally absurd to pretend that the different condition of a subjective fear of EM exposure is related to the established objective condition of physical sensitivity. The objective condition of physical sensitivity was discovered in 1932 and convincingly established in detail in the 1960s. The invalidated fear hypothesis was allegedly promulgated by the EMF Project in 2004 to protect the wireless industry.

I am involved with many hundreds of people who now suffer from sensitivity to environmental electromagnetic exposure. These include young children, like animals and plants, for whom the WHO's EMF Project's invalidated fear or psychological hypothesis of 2004 is totally irrelevant and unscientific.

I have therefore attached my paper detailing some errors in medical assumptions in the draft. As you can see, the WHO's draft EHC-RF needs substantial re-writing if it is to be scientifically valid.

Last year I addressed my concerns to Dr van Deventer of the EMF Project, but I have not had a reply. I therefore feel that you personally should be aware of the growing frustration and consternation in the UK, and elsewhere, over the current refusal of parts of the WHO to accept the majority science. Instead of fulfilling the WHO's remit to foster everyone's health, this EHC draft appears to support the pro-wireless industry's minority negative hypothesis. This failure to understand or even study all the literature from the 1960s onwards about objective physical sensitivity to electromagnetic exposure has ruined, and is ruining, the lives of a growing number of people in the UK and elsewhere.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Bevington
Chair of Trustees, ElectroSensitivity UK,
BM Box ES-UK, London, WC1N 3XX
www.es-uk.info