Feedback to ICNIRP re. draft document

By Michael Vaughan

I believe there is far too geat an emphasis on the possible adverse health effects caused by temperature change in human tissues. There are many other possible mechanisms of harm which should be receiving far greater attention.

Many countries around the world have chosen to set much lower Safety Standards than those recommended by ICNIRP. They have done so on the basis of the lack of clarity around the exposure levels required to result in various biological changes in human tissue.

For example, changes to the flow of ions into human cells may well result in a cascade of effects at cellular level that could potentially be harmful. If mitochondrial functioning is affected, there could very well be serious health consequences unrelated to any thermal effects.

ICNIRP’s apparent obsession with thermal effects is misplaced as there are many other possible mechanisms of harm. Cellular communication is an incredibly delicate and complex process and it seems quite plausible that this could be disrupted by EMF exposure.

Therefore, I strongly believe that ICNIRP’s current guidelines do not adequately protect the general public as they are primarily based on exposure levels required to result in temperature changes in human tissue. The current draft document again has a heavy emphasis on possible thermal effects, even though this is but one of the many possible mechanisms of harm.

We cannot assume that adverse health effects do not result from changes at cellular level resulting from EMF exposure at levels below the ICNIRP guidelines.

Conseuently there is no basis for confidence that ICNIRP’s guidelines are adequately protective.