



Letter to the United Nations Environment Programme
Transmitting the International EMF Scientist Appeal

June 25, 2019

Attention: Inger Andersen, Executive Director, U.N. Environment Programme

**We are forwarding to you *the International EMF Scientist Appeal*¹
with a renewed and urgent request**

This Appeal, now signed by 247 scientists in 42 nations, was initially submitted to the U.N. Secretary-General, the World Health Organization (WHO) Director-General, and to the U.N. Environment Programme Executive (UNEP) Director in May, 2015. The Appeal has been readdressed to the current leaders of the U.N. and its sub-organizations since that time. To date, we have not received a formal reply.

We are now bringing the Appeal to the attention of UNEP again, as an urgent matter, and are asking UNEP to investigate the potential for harm being posed to plants, animals and humans by man-made, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (EMF) pollution.

The signatories to this Appeal have published peer-reviewed papers on the biological and health effects of EMF. These scientists have published more than 2,000 papers and letters about EMF in professional journals. The Appeal continues to be signed by concerned scientists and is viewed as an authoritative and credible statement internationally, often referred to as a part of public testimony and policy proposals, in peer-reviewed scientific literature, and by the media.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified Extremely Low Frequency and Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields as possible human carcinogens (2002, 2011). Yet, although the WHO has adopted IARC's classifications, it has not acted aggressively to encourage more independent research, to call for health-based EMF standards or, to call for precautionary measures to protect the general public and especially pregnant women and children. Meanwhile, national and international standard-setting groups and the WHO continue to state that there is "no credible evidence" of harm from exposure to EMF. It is indeed shocking to note that the WHO EMF Project has endorsed the obsolete EMF-exposure guidelines set by a German NGO that provides guidance on EMF-exposure

¹ International Appeal: Scientists call for protection from non-ionizing electromagnetic field exposure. *European J Oncology*. 20(3/4). 2015. <https://www.mattioli1885journals.com/index.php/Europeanjournalofoncology/article/view/4971/3658>

limits, the ICNIRP, and is seeking to influence nations world-wide to “harmonize” EMF exposure standards with these guidelines, even though they are not sufficiently protective of humankind or nature and do not take into account the numerous health effects studies that have been published since the IARC evaluations.

The world is in the midst of the *Wireless Age*, a rapidly-evolving societal transformation that fundamentally relies on applications of wireless communications. The planet is increasingly being polluted by the multitude of EMF, generated to propel these technologies, terrestrially and by satellite, causing rising levels of EMF in the atmosphere, creating chronic electrosmog pollution conditions that greatly increase health risk.

In 2017, the Advisors to the International EMF Scientist Appeal called for a halt to the 5th Generation (5G) wireless deployment prior to safety testing, stating: “We recommend that, in keeping with the U.N. Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, to ‘Protect, Respect and Remedy.’, 5G technologies must be subjected to an independent health and safety assessment before they are launched.” The public needs assurance that future wireless technologies are safe and do not increase cancer risk. With regard to human health and environmental protection, policy decisions based on assumptions of safety without adequate testing are not in the best interest of public health.

In the Appeal, UNEP is asked “to convene and fund an independent multidisciplinary committee to explore the pros and cons of alternatives to current practices that could substantially lower human exposures to nonionizing electromagnetic radiation (NIEER). The deliberations of this group should be conducted in a transparent and impartial way. Although it is essential that industry be involved and cooperate in this process, industry should not be allowed to bias its processes or conclusions. This group should provide their analysis to the UN and the WHO to guide precautionary action.”

We propose that the United Nations Environment Programme undertake an unbiased, comprehensive review of the scientific literature on EMF effects on the natural environment and make recommendations that could be applied as an integral part of developing international and national health-based and environmentally-protective EMF-exposure standards. Many of the EMF scientists who signed this appeal have published studies in peer-reviewed journals on the effects of EMF on animals and plants, in addition to studies on humans. For example, scientific studies have documented aggressive behavior, reduced productivity, swarming and abandoning hive among *honey bee populations* (Harst et al. 2006, Warnke 2009, Favre 2011, Kumar et al. 2011, Patezhy 2009, Sahib 2011); aggressive behavior, impaired reproduction and interference with migration among *bird populations* (Southern 1975, Larkin and Sutherland 1977, Balmori 2004, Balmori and Hallberg 2007, Everaert and Bauwens 2007, Fernie et al. 2010, Engels et al. 2015, Wiltchko et al. 2015); deformities and population decline among *amphibians* (Balmori 2006, Balmori 2010); insects (Cucurachi et al. 2013); reduced productivity, impaired reproduction, and sudden death among *livestock*, especially dairy cows (Burchard et al. 1996, Loscher and Kas 1998, Hillman et al. 2013, Stetzer et al. 2016); and reduced growth, increased infection and/or physiological/morphological effects in *plant populations* that can be attributed to different forms of electrosmog (Balodis et al. 1996, Haggerty 2010, Halgamuge 2016, Waldmann-Selsam et al. 2016, Havas and Symington 2016, Vian et al. 2016).

Three long-term exposure studies of rodents showed evidence of cancer at 900, 1,800, and 2,400 MHz (Chou et al 1992, NTP 2018, Falcioni et al. 2019).

By engaging directly in investigating this controversial issue, as we propose here, UNEP would be in the position to respond to the concerns many scientists, public officials, and the general public are raising.

Further, we request that you bring to the attention of the United Nations the need to resolve a major policy discrepancy that is preventing protective actions from being taken to protect humankind and the environment from adverse effects of EMF. Namely, the International Agency on Research on Cancer's (IARC) classification of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as a possible Group 2B carcinogen in 2011, subsequently adopted by the World Health Organization, has been ignored by the WHO EMF Project. The IARC just announced plans to conduct another scientific review of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as early as 2022. There are no exposure standards to protect plants and animals. The U.N. should act immediately to resolve these internal differences, issue precautionary warnings, and convene scientific meetings to independently evaluate the risk.

We urgently call for an investigation into this matter by the U.N. Environment Programme, under guidance by the U.N. Secretary General, Antonio Guterres. Otherwise, the entire world may face a health and environmental crisis caused by man-made EMF pollution.

The signed version of the International EMF Scientist Appeal may be viewed at www.emfscientist.org.

We would appreciate your timely reply and are available to discuss this matter further.

Kind regards,

Elizabeth Kelley, MA
Director, EMFscientist.org

On behalf of the Advisors to the International EMF Scientist Appeal:
Magda Havas, Ph.D., Henry Lai, Ph.D., Ronald Melnick, Ph.D., Joel Moskowitz, Ph.D.
and Annie Sasco, MD, DrPH

Email: info@emfscientist.org
Tel: 1-520-912-4878 (landline)

Cc: Joyce Msuya, Deputy Director, Former Acting Executive Director, U.N. Environment Programme

References Cited:

Balmori A. 2004. Effects of Electromagnetic Fields of Phone Masts on a Population of white storks (*Ciconia ciconia*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 24: 109–119

- Balmori A. 2006. The incidence of electromagnetic pollution on the amphibian decline: Is this an important piece of the puzzle? *Toxicological & Environmental Chemistry* 88 (2): 287–299.
- Balmori A. 2010. Mobile phone mast effects on common frog (*Rana temporaria*) tadpoles: the city turned into a laboratory. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 29 (1–2):31–35.
- Balmori A and O Hallberg. 2007. The Urban Decline of the House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): A Possible Link with Electromagnetic Radiation. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 26 (2): 141–151.
- Balodis V, G Briimelis, K Kalvickis, et al. 1996. Does the Skrunda Radio Location Station diminish the radial growth of pine trees? *The Science of the Total Environment* 180: 57-64.
- Burchard JF, DH Nguyen DH, and M Rodriguez. 2006. Plasma concentrations of thyroxine in dairy cows exposed to 60 Hz electric and magnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 27 (7): 553–559.
- Chou C-K, A Guy, LL Kunz, RB Johnson, JJ Crowley and J. H. Krupp. 1992. Long-Term, Low-Level Microwave Irradiation of Rats, *Bioelectromagnetics* 13:469–496.
- Cucurachi S, WLM Tamis et al. 2013. A review of the ecological effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF), *Environment International* 51:116–140.
- Engels S, N-L Schneider, N Lefeldt, et al. 2015. Anthropogenic electromagnetic noise disrupts magnetic compass orientation in a migratory bird. *Nature* 509: 353.
- Everaert J and D Bauwens. 2007. A possible effect of electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone base stations on the number of breeding house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) *Electromagn Biol Med.* 26 (1): 63–72.
- Falcioni L, L Bua, E Tibaldi, et al. 2019. Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission. *Environmental Research* 165:496–503.
- Favre D. 2011. Mobile phone-induced honeybee worker piping. *Apidologie* 42 (3): 270– 279.
- Ferni KJ, NJ Leonard and DM Bird. 2010. Behavior of free-ranging and captive American kestrels under electromagnetic fields. *J. Tox. and Environ. Health Part A* Vol 59 (8).
- Haggerty K. 2010. Adverse Influence of Radio Frequency Background on Trembling Aspen Seedlings: Preliminary Observations. *International Journal of Forestry Research* 2010, 7 pages.
- Halgamuge MN. 2016. Review: Weak radiofrequency radiation exposure from mobile phone radiation on plants. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 2016 Sep 20:1–23. [Epub ahead of print]
- Harst W, J Kuhn, and H Stever. 2006. Can electromagnetic exposure cause a change in behaviour? Studying possible non-thermal influences on honey bees—An approach within the framework of Educational Informatics. *Acta Systematica – IIAS Intern. J.* 6: 1–6.

Havas M and MS Symington. 2016. Effects of Wi-Fi Radiation on Germination and Growth of Garden Cress (*Lepidium sativum*), Broccoli (*Brassica oleracea*), Red Clover (*Trifolium pratense*) and Pea (*Pisum sativum*) Seedlings: A Partial Replication Study. *Current Chemical Biology* 10 (1): 65–73.

Hillman D, D Stetzer, M Graham, CL Goeke, et al. 2013. Relationship of electric power quality to milk production of dairy herds – Field study with literature review. *Science of the Total Environment* 447: 500–514.

Kumar NR, S Sangwan and P Badotra. 2011. Exposure to cell phone radiations produces biochemical changes in worker honey bees. *Toxicol Int.* 18 (1): 70–72.

Larkin RP and PJ Sutherland. 1977. Migrating birds respond to Project Seafarer's electromagnetic field. *Science.* 195 (4280): 777–9.

Löscher W, and G Käs. 1998. Extraordinary Behavior Disorders in Cows in Proximity to Transmission Stations. Translated from German language. *Der Praktische Tierarz* 79 (5): 4377 444.

NTP 2018. NTP Technical Report on the Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies in Hsd:Sprague Dawley SD Rats exposed to Whole-body Radio Frequency Radiation at a Frequency (900 MHz) and Modulations (GSM and CDMA) used by Cell Phones. National Toxicology Program, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 384 pp.

Pattazhy S. 2009. Mobile phone towers a threat to honey bees: Study. *The Times of India*, August 2009. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS/Science/Mobile-phonetowers-a-threatto-honeybees-Study/articleshow/4955867.cms> .

Southern WE. 1975. Orientation of gull chicks exposed to project Sanguine's electromagnetic field. *Science.* 189 (4197): 143–145.

Stetzer D, AM Leavitt, CL Goeke, and M Havas. 2016. Monitoring and remediation of on-farm and off-farm ground current measured as step potential on a Wisconsin dairy farm: A case study. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 35 (4): 321–336.

Vian, A, E Davies, M Gendraud and P Bonnet. 2016. Plant Responses to High Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, *BioMed research International* Vol. 2015 Article ID 1830262, 13 pp.

Waldmann-Selsam, A Balmori-de la Puente, H Breunig and A Balmori. 2016. Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phonebase stations. *Science of the Total Environment* 572: 13 554–569.

Warnke U. 2009. Bees, Birds and Mankind. Destroying Nature by ‘Electrosmog’ Effects of Wireless Communication Technologies, A Brochure Series by the Competence Initiative for the Protection of Humanity, Environment and Democracy, 47 pp.

Wiltschko R, P Thalau, D Gehring, C Niessner, T Ritz and W. Wiltschko. 2015. Magnetoreception in birds: the effect of radio-frequency fields. *J R Soc Interface* 12(103).