

BUT WHY ARE THERE SO MANY STUDIES THAT SEEM TO SHOW “NO EFFECT” OF WIRELESS RADIATION?

Radiofrequency radiation is **the new tobacco**. Anyone sincerely reading the science should be **deeply, deeply concerned**.

Dr. Damien Downing,
President of The British Society for
Ecological Medicine

- **Money matters (a lot)**
 - Compared to studies funded by governments or institutions, studies funded by telecommunications companies are **1.5 – 2.5x less likely to report an “effect”** of wireless radiation at everyday exposure levels (McCredden 2023; Huss et al 2007).
- **A “lack of evidence of harm” (on some studies) does not prove a lack of potential harm, especially when looking for a proverbial “needle in a haystack”**
 - Many studies show “no effect” of a specific frequency/power density on a specific part of biological health. But this does NOT mean wireless radiation is “safe,” it just means the scientists didn’t find evidence of harm for those specifics.



- **Many studies focus on thermal damage, short term exposure, and immediate impacts**
 - But studies show that the health risks of everyday RF exposure are non-thermal (Pakhomov et al 1997abc; Marconi et al. 2015) and chronic (long-term exposure and cumulative impacts)

- **Biophysics is complicated: scientists are still trying to figure out exactly how wireless radiation affects biology**
 - Studies suggest many of the biological responses to RF are:
 - dependent on the specific frequency of the wireless signal (Pakhomov et al 1997, Markovà 2005, Sarimov et al. 2004)
 - dependent on genetic, physiological, and physical variables (Belyaev et al 2000)
- **Wireless radiation is complicated, too**
 - There are countless variables: frequency, power density, duration/location of the application, modulation, wave form, etc. ...it’s enough to make anyone’s head spin, and at the very least, leaves a lot of room for error and potentially, deception.
 - Many of the “uncertainties” in methods for measuring radiation (e.g., dosimetry) are “likely to be related to the inherent variability in real-world exposures,” and there is a need for “developing improved exposure/dosimetric techniques for the higher microwave frequencies to be used by forthcoming communications technologies” (Foster, Ziskin & Balzano 2022).

For complete references (and links to these studies) please see “current science” section of our website.



**GREATER HARTFORD COALITION
FOR SAFE TECHNOLOGY**
www.GHC4SafeTech.com. info@ghc4safetech.com