

My name is Steven Weller and I wrote this Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS) case study that is included with this covering statement with the hope it may be of benefit to those who either find themselves in a similar position to me, or, maybe just interested in a getting a better understanding of what EHS is and the likely cause.

The study documents my personal journey towards self-diagnosis as being EHS, the ensuing questions it raised, along with information which might assist fellow sufferers to better cope with a condition which, until relatively recently, was unknown on our planet.

Initially, I wasn't even aware that there was such a condition as EHS. It was purely by accident that I discovered that I was sensitive to certain radiofrequencies (RF). I have 25 years' experience working in Information Technology. Radiofrequencies have been a significant part of the landscape for me for a number of years.

At the time I first made the connection between my symptoms and exposure to certain technology, it was a simply a matter of making a few minor adjustments, and I was able to manage my condition. Life continued as normal. The mandatory rollout of wireless smart meters in my neighbourhood unfortunately changed all this.

I was torpedoed onto a path which has involved me in spending countless fruitless hours seeking answers from the medical establishment and government agencies, innumerable amounts of time conducting my own research, followed by a quest to seek answers from the authorities who pronounce upon the safety of our RF standards. A high level of protection is offered I am told. I have been sorely disappointed by their response. Unfortunately, Governments and the Industry appear to be focused only on the perceived benefits of these technologies (and money) without considering any potential long term health implications that they may bring.

We are bio-electrical systems. Our bodies do not incorporate elaborate shielding and we are not impervious or hardened against this form of radiation, which today can be billions or more times higher than what occurs naturally. Representatives of the industry and RF Standard bodies often assert that there is "no clear or conclusive" scientific evidence regarding the biological effects of low level or "non-thermal" RF exposures, a statement that has also been continually recycled for many years. But in actuality, a large body of scientific research documentation exists that shows RF exposures at low (non thermal) levels can produce adverse effects that have serious health implications.

Many countries around the world including Australia have adopted ICNIRP 1998 RF Guidelines. In a ICNIRP Statement released in 2002 which is obfuscated with a document title of "philosophy" <http://www.icnirp.de/documents/philosophy.pdf> clearly says on p 546 "*Some guidelines may still not provide adequate protection for certain sensitive individuals nor for normal individuals exposed concomitantly to other agents...*" that "*Different groups in a population may have differences in their ability to tolerate a particular NIR exposure. For example, children, the elderly, and some chronically ill people might have a lower tolerance for one or more forms of NIR exposure than the rest of the population.*" (NIR – Non Ionising Radiation)

The World Health Organisation also has the following to say about current ICNIRP RF "Guidelines"

"What guidelines cannot account for..."

"...Guidelines are set for the average population and cannot directly address the requirements of a minority of potentially more sensitive people...." Source: <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/about/WhatisEMF/en/index4.html>

It is obvious in my eyes that there is no desire to uncover the truth because of the legal implications to governments and the industry around the world. It seems that we who are EHS are collateral damage in the name of progress.

It's been a lonely and frustrating journey. Hopefully, this study might make the road a little easier for those that follow. Sadly, with rapidly escalating levels of electro-smog around the globe, I believe these numbers will undoubtedly be increasing.

In closing I would like to quote Dr Julian Hollis:

"Science is all about free investigation in order to discover facts, regardless of popular 'consensus'. Theories are always open to and under review and data are re-examined; no matter how much 'truth' is valued; even ideologically protected. There is also a vital role to be played through constructive imagination...what would happen if? There is always a need to remain fearlessly open to new, unexpected, even unwelcome discoveries. Past history records over and over again unwelcome discoveries that have forced change: thus those scientists brave enough to challenge vested interests or systems of mass belief have usually been dismissed, sidelined; even brutalized" ('Geology of Change' class notes 10th February 2012 provided to me by an associate).

Whilst the above statements are in the context of the Earth Sciences, I would suggest the comments are perhaps even more relevant to the debate currently raging within the scientific community over evidence of adverse effects in the non-ionizing area of the electromagnetic spectrum.