

I am not a scientist and I do not claim to understand the science behind non-ionizing radiation, or any other kind of radiation.

However, I do understand something about the “sociology” of science.

I have read about disputes between scientists regarding the safety of this technology, and it reminds me of the disputes that exist(ed) between independent scientists and scientists who had been hired by the powerful tobacco industry. Of course, we all know now that “tobacco science” was a special kind of science: it was science that the industry paid for to prove the safety of their products, despite the evidence of independent scientists.

Regarding electromagnetic radiation/the wireless industry:

- I have heard about too many public figures who have died from glioblastomas and this seems to coincide with popular use of cellphones; as well, I’m sure there are many more unknown humans who have suffered similarly.
- I have read about people who have EHS and react very negatively to electromagnetic radiation; this is despite the fact that some doctors/scientists claim this can not be because it is a psychological/psychotic condition.
- I understand that there are jurisdictions where the safety of electromagnetic radiation is not even disputed: A cellphone store in Berkeley, California wants to publicize warnings that are found deep within the products they are selling and the CTIA is challenging the legality of the store’s ability to publicize this information (the challenge is based on “freedom of speech” protection in the American constitution).
- I find it very curious that fire halls in the state of California fought successfully to be exempt from having to have cell towers installed on their buildings but individual residences can not freely be exempted.
- It is clear that the international community does not now agree on safe levels of electromagnetic radiation and, apparently, the US military warnings from many years/decades ago contradict current standards of practice.
- The science behind the multimillion dollar NTP must be addressed; it must NOT be ignored.
- The Ramazzini Study must be addressed; it must NOT be ignored.

There seems to be a tremendous amount of contradictory information about the safety of electromagnetic radiation. To eliminate the possibility of utilizing “tobacco science” to determine the safety of this technology to create a “further robust critique of this public health document”, it is vital that only scientists with no direct relationship to industry, or to institutions supported by industry, be members of the ICNIRP who are critiquing this public health document. As well, it is vital that medical doctors and oncologists, not electrical engineers, be included to assess safety and health issues created by electromagnetic radiation. If the new members/direction of the ICNIRP is to have any credibility, the above issues must be addressed.

