

Wireless Technology Violates Human Rights

How universal exposure to radiation from wireless devices complying with existing inadequate safety limits violates the Nuremberg Code of Ethics

Catherine Kleiber, www.electricalpollution.com

The report “Wi-Fi – A Thalidomide in the Making. Who Cares?” by Barrie Trower makes it clear that **exposure to radiation from wireless technology will cause DNA damage, including damage to the mitochondrial DNA that is irreparable and will transmit to all future progeny** of affected females. In a mouse study, “*RF Radiation–Induced Changes in the Prenatal Development of Mice*” (http://avaate.org/IMG/pdf/magras_mice_study.pdf), six months of real-life ambient exposure to a medley of radiation sources at levels well below those allowed by FCC RF limits resulted in total sterility, which did not reverse. It would be expected to take longer in humans, however this finding supports the urgency of the points Mr. Trower makes in his report which can be found at <http://www.electricalpollution.com/documents/WiFiAThalidomideInTheMakingWhoCares.pdf>.

Thus, there is NO possible way that the FCC can both promote wireless technology and protect the public health and safety, as directed by the House Committee on Commerce in H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94.

Obviously, Congress made clear with the stipulation that it was the FCC's responsibility to adopt uniform RF regulations "with adequate safeguards of the public health and safety" (H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94) that they were not interested in promoting wireless technology at the expense of the public health and safety.

The **FCC is obligated by the directive in H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 to inform Congress it is impossible to both promote wireless and protect the public health and safety** since it is now clear that wireless technology has the potential to compromise the genetic integrity of individuals for all future generations. Continued promotion of wireless technology in spite of that and the following evidence:

- Report of Partial Findings from the National Toxicology Program Carcinogenesis Studies of Cell Phone Radiofrequency Radiation in Hsd: Sprague Dawley® SD rats (Whole Body Exposures) bioRxiv preprint first posted online May. 26, 2016 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/055699>)
- *Tumor Promotion by Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields Below Exposure Limits for Humans* (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25749340>)
- The BioInitiative Reports (www.bioinitiative.org)
- Biological Effects from RF Radiation at Low-Intensity Exposure, based on the BioInitiative 2012 Report, and the Implications for Smart Meters and Smart Appliances (<http://emfsafetynetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Biological-Effects-From-RF-Radiation-and-Implications-for-Smart-Meters-June-5-2013-2.pdf>)
- “Provocation study using heart rate variability shows microwave radiation from 2.4 GHz cordless phone affects autonomic nervous system” (<http://www.magdahavas.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Havas-HRV-Ramazzini1.pdf>) and replicated (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23675629#>)
- “Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation” (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26151230>)

- "Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review" (http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4_4_2012/Vol4_4_202-216_BM-8.pdf)
- "Report on Possible Impacts of Communication Towers on Wildlife Including Birds and Bees" (http://www.moef.nic.in/downloads/public-information/final_mobile_towers_report.pdf)
- "CRITICISM OF THE HEALTH ASSESSMENT IN THE ICNIRP GUIDELINES FOR RADIOFREQUENCY AND MICROWAVE RADIATION (100 kHz - 300 GHz)" (www.electricalpollution.com/documents/Cherry2000EMR_ICNIRP_critique_09-02.pdf)
- "Swedish review strengthens grounds for concluding that radiation from cellular and cordless phones is a probable human carcinogen" (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23664410>)

would not only violate the directive in H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 which said it was the Commission's responsibility to adopt uniform RF regulations "with adequate safeguards of the public health and safety" and the principles of public health protection, but also be in direct violation of the entire Nuremberg Code of Ethics (<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/archive/nurcode.html>).

Prior to approval of wireless technology for civilian use, it is clear from "Wi-Fi – A Thalidomide in the Making. Who Cares?" that it was already known that there were bio-effects from exposure to pulsed microwave radiation that were separate from tissue heating and it is clear from Cellular Telephone Russian Roulette: A Historical and Scientific Perspective (http://microondes.files.wordpress.com/2010/03/robert_c_kane_cellular_telephone_russian_roulette.pdf) that extensive scientific literature existed showing that harmful tissue heating could occur extremely quickly and locally at levels well below those allowed by the ICNIRP and IEEE limits and also that ample evidence existed of disabling effects on organisms when chronically exposed to RF radiation.

Reasonable people with full access to the data could and did think a dangerous situation was being created by 1984, see "Biological Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation" (EPA 600/8-83-026F, 1984) (<http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=300065H1.txt>) and then again prior to the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act (http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case_law/docs/epa_to_fcc_3nov_93.pdf). In spite of this, no biologically protective safety limits were implemented to protect citizens during daily life.

It violates the Nuremberg Code of Ethics to experiment on non-consenting people who cannot stop the experiment, especially when harm can reasonably be expected to result. That is exactly what has happened and is happening. The fact that those reasonable expectations have been fulfilled can be seen in The BioInitiative Reports and in many of the documents submitted for consideration within these FCC dockets (ET Docket No. 13-84, and ET Docket No. 03-137).

Industry continues to generate uncertainty, in spite of the numerous well-designed studies showing harm, and continues to call for additional studies instead of action. Results of the society-wide human experiment continue to roll in which demonstrate the harmfulness of the technology. A small sample of these studies are below:

- "Prenatal and Postnatal Exposure to Cell Phone Use and Behavioral Problems in Children" (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18467962>)
- "Apparent decreases in Swedish public health indicators after 1997—Are they due to improved diagnostics or to environmental factors?," Hallberg and Johansson ([http://www.pathophysiologyjournal.com/article/S0928-4680\(09\)00002-9/abstract](http://www.pathophysiologyjournal.com/article/S0928-4680(09)00002-9/abstract))

- “The Influence of Being Physically Near to a Cell Phone Transmission Mast on the Incidence of Cancer” (http://emrstop.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=4&Itemid=18)
- “Changes of Clinically Important Neurotransmitters under the Influence of Modulated RF Fields- A Long-term Study under Real-life Conditions” (http://www.radiationresearch.org/images/RRT_articles/Buchner%20Eger%20Rimbach%20Study%202011%20ENG%20FINAL%20Revised%2029%20July%202011.pdf)
- “How does long term exposure to base stations and mobile phones affect human hormone profiles?.” Eskander et al. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009912011027330>)
- “Microwave frequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs) produce widespread neuropsychiatric effects including depression.” (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jchemneu.2015.08.001>)

Indeed, in light of evidence that harm could be expected from its use and exposure is involuntary in many cases, there has been a violation of the entire Nuremberg Code of Ethics since RF technology was approved for civilian use without biologically-meaningful RF safety limits in place, specifically “1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential ...” and “9. During the course of the experiment, the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end...”. Millions of people are being exposed to a dangerous toxin in an open-ended non-consenting experiment which they cannot bring to an end and over which they have no control.

Performing additional studies without immediate action to put protective safety limits in place based on the array of existing studies showing harm, only continues the massive violation of human rights.

The fact that any new microwave-based technology **might** be safer is no excuse to contend that this open-ended non-consenting experiment should continue. Any new **possibly** safer technology should be studied in double-blind placebo controlled medical-style laboratory safety studies using approved protocols carefully designed to detect health effects before being allowed to undergo **controlled consenting** medical-style human studies. The track record of previous microwave-based (wireless) technology and the Nuremberg Code of Ethics demands it!

Therefore, the **FCC is obligated** by H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94, by the principles of public health protection, and by the Nuremberg Code of Ethics **to immediately place a moratorium on additional spectrum sales, antenna installations, transmitting utility meter installations, new wireless technologies, and sales of wireless devices**, while notifying Congress, The Environmental Protection Agency, The Center for Disease Control, The National Institute of Health, and The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services of the **serious health hazard posed by wireless technology and seeking their professional support in developing RF safety limits that truly protect the public health from biological harm**. *If further experiments are needed, they should be done immediately using approved medical-style protocols, not using the entire population in an inescapable uncontrolled study done without consent.*

If the FCC would like to argue that this is not an experiment because data collection is not consistent enough and negative outcomes were expected or known, then population-wide exposure to this toxin is still either “inhuman treatment” or “torture,” both of which are human rights violations. **Money is not a justifiable reason to expose an entire population to a potentially lethal agent that can be reasonably expected to isolate and disable many, impairing their ability to reach their full potential and live their life fully and freely.**