



SECTION 2

Statement of the Problem

Cindy Sage, MA
Sage Associates, USA

Prepared for the BioInitiative Working Group
August 2007

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Background and Objectives

This Report is the product of an international research and public policy initiative to document what is known of biological effects that occur at low-intensity EMF exposures (for both radiofrequency radiation RF and power-frequency ELF, and various forms of combined exposures that are now known to be bioactive). The Report has been written to document the reasons why current public exposure standards for non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation are no longer good enough to protect public health.

A working group composed of scientists, researchers and public health policy professionals (The BioInitiative Working Group) has joined together to document the information that must be considered in the international debate about the adequacy (or inadequacy) of existing public exposure standards.

Recognizing that other bodies in the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, many European Union and eastern European countries as well as the World Health Organization are actively debating this topic, the BioInitiative Working Group has conducted a independent science and public health policy review process.

Objectives

- 1) To establish a working group
- 2) To evaluate literature reviews for IEEE (2006) and WHO (2007) initiatives on standards that have resulted in (or continue to recommend) no change in thermally-based public exposure limits.
- 3) To identify systematic screening-out techniques that consequently under-report, omit or overlook results of scientific studies reporting low-intensity bioeffects and/or potential health effects.
- 4) To document key scientific studies and reviews that identify low-intensity effects for which any new human exposure standards should provide safety limits.
- 5) To document key “chains of evidence” that must be taken into account in new human exposure standards (melatonin and free-radical production effects on DNA damage and/or repair; stress protein induction at low-intensity levels; etc.)
- 6) To write a rationale for a biologically-based human exposure standard,
- 7) To identify “next steps” in advancing biologically-based exposure standards that are protective of public health; that are derived in traditional public health approaches.

Eleven (11) chapters documenting key scientific studies and reviews that identify low-intensity effects of electromagnetic fields have been produced by the members of the BioInitiative Working Group; four additional chapters are provided that discuss public health considerations, how the scientific information should be evaluated in the context of prudent public health policy, and discussing the basis for taking precautionary and preventative actions that are proportionate to the knowledge at hand. Other scientific review bodies and agencies have reached different conclusions by adopting standards of evidence so unreasonably high as to exclude any finding of scientific concern, and thus justify retaining outdated thermal standards. The clear consensus of the BioInitiative Working Group members is that the existing public safety limits are inadequate. New approaches to development of public safety standards are needed based on biologically-based effects, rather than based solely on RF heating (or induced currents in the case of ELF). The Report concludes with recommended actions that are proportionate to the evidence and in accord with prudent public health policy.

The Report also presents information about what level of scientific evidence is sufficient to make changes now. It addresses the questions:

- What is “proof”? Do we need proof before we take any action? Is an unreasonably high and overly-restrictive definition of “proof” what is keeping some governments from facing the evidence that the need for new public exposure limits is demonstrated?
- What is sufficient evidence? How much evidence is needed? Do we have it yet?
- Do scientists and public health experts differ on when action is warranted? If so, how?
- What is the prudent course of action when the consequence of doing nothing is likely to have serious global consequences on public health, confidence in governments and social/economic resources?
- What are the costs of guessing wrong and under-reacting? Or, of over-reacting?
- Whose opinions should count in the process of deciding about health risks and harm?
- Is the global, governmental process addressing these questions transparent and responsive to public concerns? Or, is it a cosmetic process giving the illusion of transparency and democratic participation? Are some countries ostracized for views and actions that are more protective of public health? How can we equitably decide on the appropriate level of public protection within each country, when it is obvious that some countries would be best off spending their time and money on basic medical needs and infrastructure improvements to save lives, when others need to look at prevailing disease endpoints relevant to their populations, and wish to act accordingly?

- How has the effort for global harmonization of ELF and RF exposure standards thwarted the efforts of individual countries to read, reason and choose?
- How much control have special interests exerted over harmonization goals and safety standards? How much over scientific funding, research design, dissemination of research results and media control? Are the interests of the public being conserved?
- What actions are proportionate to the knowledge we now have? What is preventative action and how does it differ from precautionary action?

It describes what the existing exposure standards are, and how some international governmental bodies are standing by the old exposure standards despite evidence that change is needed.

A good way to compare what kind of actions should be taken now is to look at what has been done with other environmental toxicants. It is well-established that public health decision-makers should act before it is too late to prevent damage that can reasonably be expected now; especially where the harm may be serious and widespread. Some actions that can prevent future harm are identified. The basis for taking action now rather than later is explained. This report can serve as a basis for arguing the scientific and public health policy reasons that changes are needed. It documents information for decision-makers and the public who want to understand what is already known biological effects occurring at low-intensity exposures; and why it is reasonable to expect our governmental agencies to develop new, biologically-based exposure standards that protect the public.

Problems with Existing Public Health Standards (Safety Limits)

Today's public exposure limits are based on the presumption that heating is the only concern when living organisms are exposed to RF and ELF. These exposures can create tissue heating that is well known to be harmful in even very short-term doses. As such, thermal limits do serve a purpose. For example, for people whose occupations require them to work around electrical power lines or heat-sealers, or for people who install and service wireless antenna towers; thermally-based limits are necessary to prevent damage from heating (or, in the case of ELF - from induced currents in tissues). In the past, scientists and engineers developed exposure standards for electromagnetic radiation based what we now believe are faulty assumptions that the right way to measure how much non-ionizing energy humans can tolerate (how much exposure) without harm is to measure only the heating of tissue (for – induced currents in the body). In the last few decades, it has been established beyond any reasonable doubt that bioeffects and some adverse health effects occur at far lower levels of RF and exposure where no heating occurs at all; some effects are shown to occur at several hundred thousand times below the existing public safety limits

where heating is an impossibility. Effects occur at non-thermal or low-intensity exposure levels far below the levels that federal agencies say should keep the public safe. For many new devices operating with wireless technologies, the devices are exempt from any regulatory standards. The existing standards have been proven to be inadequate to control against harm from low-intensity, chronic exposures, based on any reasonable, independent assessment of the scientific literature. It means that an entirely new basis (a biological basis) for new exposure standards is needed. New standards need to take into account what we have learned about the effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and to design new limits based on biologically-demonstrated effects that are important to proper biological function in living organisms. It is vital to do so because the explosion of new sources has created unprecedented levels of artificial electromagnetic fields that now cover all but remote areas of the habitable space on earth. Mid-course corrections are needed in the way we accept, test and deploy new technologies that expose us to ELF and RF in order to avert public health problems of a global nature.

At least three decades of scientific study and observation of effects on humans and animals shows that non-thermal exposure levels can result in biologically-relevant effects. There should be no effects occurring at all. Yet, clearly they do occur. This means the standards for protecting public health are based on the wrong premise - that only what heats tissue can result in harm. It does appear that it is the INFORMATION conveyed by electromagnetic radiation, rather than the heat, which causes biological changes, some of which may lead to unwellness, illness and even death, According to Adey (2004):

“There are major unanswered questions about possible health risks that may arise from human exposures to various man-made electromagnetic fields where these exposures are intermittent, recurrent, and may extend over a significant portion of the lifetime of an individual. Current equilibrium thermodynamic models fail to explain an impressive spectrum of observed bioeffects at non-thermal exposure levels.”

Recent opinions by experts have documented deficiencies in current exposure standards. There is widespread discussion that thermal limits are outdated, and that biologically-based exposure standards are needed. Section 4 describes concerns expressed by WHO, 2007 in its Health Criteria Monograph; the SCENIHR Report, 2006 prepared for the European Commission; the UK SAGE Report, 2007; the Health Protection Agency, United Kingdom in 2005; the NATO Advanced Research Workshop in 2005; the US Radiofrequency Interagency Working Group in 1999; the US Food and Drug Administration in 2000 and 2007; the World Health Organization in 2002; the World Health Organization International Agency for Cancer Research (IARC, 2001), the United Kingdom Parliament Independent Expert Group Report (Stewart Report, 2000) and others.

A pioneer researcher, the late Dr. Ross Adey, in his last publication in Bioelectromagnetic Medicine (P. Roche and M. Markov, eds. 2004) concluded:

“There are major unanswered questions about possible health risks that may arise from exposures to various man-made electromagnetic fields where these human exposures are intermittent, recurrent, and may extend over a significant portion of the lifetime of the individual.”¹

“Epidemiological studies have evaluated and radiofrequency fields as possible risk factors for human health, with historical evidence relating rising risks of such factors as progressive rural electrification, and more recently, to methods of electrical power distribution and utilization in commercial buildings. Appropriate models describing these bioeffects are based in nonequilibrium thermodynamics, with nonlinear electrodynamics as an integral feature. Heating models, based in equilibrium thermodynamics, fail to explain an impressive new frontier of much greater significance. Though incompletely understood, tissue free radical interactions with magnetic fields may extend to zero field levels. (Adey, 2004)

References

Adey, WR. 2004. Potential Therapeutic Applications of Nonthermal Electromagnetic Fields: Ensemble Organization of Cells in Tissue as a Factor in Biological Field Sensing. Bioelectromagnetic Medicine. Rosch PJ and Markov MS, editors, page 1.

IEEE Std C95.1TM-2005 (Revision of IEEE Std C95.1-1991) IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz. I E E E 3 Park Avenue New York, NY10016-5997, USA Sponsored by the IEEE International Committee on Electromagnetic Safety (SCC39); 19 April 2006.

WHO - World Health Organization 2007. Extremely low frequency fields. Environmental Health Criteria, Vol. 238. Geneva, Switzerland.