

De : Jean-Luc Guilmot

Envoyé : mercredi 8 août 2007 23:31

Objet : RE: Responding to Repacholi's interview

Brilliant Iris, right to the point.

We as "insiders" basically all know this.

Now we need some more smart communications folks to bring this info to the outside world in the most effective ways.

Is all boils down to open people eyes that they have been and still are being fooled even though few people like to hear that kind of music...

Take care

Jean-Luc

De : Iris Atzmon

Envoyé : mercredi 8 août 2007 20:17

A : 'Krzysztof Kuklinski'; Next-up: Contact

Objet : Responding to Repacholi's interview

By "setting the record straight" Repacholi only keeps exposing himself:

A. Scientists, not Activists.

Repacholi's answers are an insult to the intelligence of both "vocal activists" and scientists, because Scientists are the ones who taught activists about the bias of science or how unscientific

Repacholi's work was during the EMF project and ICNIRP periods. (examples later).

Using Repacholi's language - it's a cheap shot to blame "vocal activists" who read studies like crazy, claiming simply that "they are not really interested in the science".

The pot calls the kettle black here.

Who are the "reasonable activist groups" Repacholi tried to engage in his work as he claims?

What are their names? When did it take place? I don't think anyone believes this.

But Repacholi found the industry to be very interested in science, didn't he?

Because it is the industry that he chose to engage in his activities over activists groups.

http://www.emfacts.com/papers/who_conflict.pdf

B. Education, not Replication

Repacholi likes very much to use the word *Science*. He inserts this word almost obsessively.

Once I read his answer to an activist who asked him about money

(about the \$150,000 a year he received from the Mobile Manufacturers Forum through the Adelaide hospital bypassing the WHO rules). Repacholi's short response included 8 times the word

(or root of the word) "science" and 0 times the word money. This was an interesting "balance" and actually exposed his method. He uses the word "science" like a drug, everytime he has to compensate for a lack of real scientific argument

or as a red herring from the financial issues he has been asked about again and again especially during the last year.

For example the study he presents as a "replication" of his mice study.

Repacholi doesn't give legitimation for a single positive study, no matter how reliable it is.

But only if it is replicated or better - "negated": The example he gives is an excellent one to expose his bias,

because Kuchel-Utteridge study was actually NOT a replication of his study, and that's what he hides

from the interviewer, and that's what he hides from the "ordinary people" who still believe in the

WHO because some WHO's workers exploit cynically their ignorance -

The Devil is in the details: Isn't it funny that Kuchel and Utteridge didn't expose the mice to radiation in weekends and

holidays, and that they continued to weigh the poor mice after they were dead? The facts about the changes the researchers made in the design of the "replication" are documented in Radiation Research 159, 274-278 (2003), and described by Scientists, not activists: Dr. Michael Kundi, Alexander Lerchl (University of Bermen). Kuchel - Utteridge did not design the study like Repacholi's was designed hence it was simply not a replication, but this doesn't prevent from Repacholi to present it as replication. This is not a scientific attitude but politics. It is pathetic to present Kuchel's study as "replication" after you read what they exactly did there. Read more about this "replication" in *Microwave News* Jan/Feb 2003 p.6 (free online)

Neil Cherry showed how unscientific the ICNIRP assesment is and he was never contradicted by the WHO and ICNIRP. In recent years more and more researchers criticized the standards in the scientific literature (Beylaev 2005) and in the European Parliament (Cherry 2000, Hyland 2000). They showed discrepancies between the studies on which the standards are based, and the interpretation that was given to them in the safety standards documents (Goldsmith 1995, Cherry 2000, Maisch 2005) and also related to the involvement of industrial interests in the World Health Organization, that were documented in a doctorate paper (Maisch 2006). The Benevento Resolution was signed by 40 scientists who admitted that the WHO/ICNIRP assesment is not objective. **Again, we talk about scientists, not activists.** (Benevento Resolution 2006). Repacoli's patronizing attitude towards activists is baseless.

C. EHS - the sensitive point of the WHO

Repacholi says: "To assess all the facts, WHO held a special workshop in Prague".... But if it was really to asses ALL the facts, why did prof Olle Johansson report this on the Prague conference:

I am very sorry to inform you that the WHO, after its "Workshop on EMF Hypersensitivity", 25-27 October 2004, in Prague, completely has denied me - after all being a participant of the workshop - the democratic right to have a formal reservation included in the summary (the latter can be found at)http://www.who.int/peh-emf/meetings/hypersensitivity_prague2004/en

The persons behind this decison are Michael Repacholi (WHO), Norbert Leitgeb (Institute of Clinical Engineering and PMG, Medical Devices European Notified Body 0636, Graz, Austria), Emilie van Deventer (WHO) and Sarah Bullock (WHO).

Since the TNO study showed the EHS case, the industry histerically started funding not physicians, not biologists, but psychologists and psychiatrists in order to show EHS is in the mind. Well, that's what psychiatrists do for a living. But an article in the Sunday Express 5.8.07 showed it will not be so easy to bury the EHS issue.

D. Evidence

Yes, Repacholi buries evidence - the studies on masts like Graham Blackwell documented, show the effects not in EHS people but in healthy people who become ill. For Repacholi these studies don't exist as well as in his EHP review he omitted long term studies on mobile phones that showed increase in tumors among users (Hardell) (and acustic neuroma positive studies). Ignoring REFLEX and its replications, claiming that non thermal mechanisms have high thresholds, using theoretical explanations of what "should" happen in order for the radiation to have an effect (page 11-12 in the EHP article) instead of recognizing existing evidence of production of free radicals and existing

others mechanisms like BBB effects, calcium efflux (claiming modulation has no effect), heat-shock proteins, etc,
this is ignoring the evidence, not considering the weight of evidence.

E. ICNIRP and WHO

Repacholi says he resigned from ICNIRP when he joined WHO but a petition was sent to Kofi Anan exactly because of this existing conflict, Anan's response did not contradict it, on the contrary, the response claimed that by working both at the WHO and ICNIRP there is no conflict. Of course, it was also revealed there that the ICNIRP is a private organization. Many of its scientists are funded by the industry.

Repacholi replied once to an activist:

"Pity is that people such as yourself won't listen to the science"

"if the science does not support your position this is not my problem".

Again, the pot calls the kettle black.

Iris.

References:

Belyaev, I., MArkova, Eva, Hillert, Lena, Malmgren L., Persson R.R.B. Microwaves from GSM mobile phones affect 53BP1 and gamma-H2AX foci in human lymphocytes from hypersensitive and healthy persons. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. online 28 April 2005.

Benevento Resolution <http://www.icems.eu/docs/BeneventoResolution.pdf>

Cherry, N. Criticism of the health assessment in the ICNIRP guidelines for radiofrequency and microwave radiation (100 kHz- 300 GHz), Lincoln University, 31/1/2000.

Goldsmith J, "Where the trail leads" *Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics* 1995 July; Vol. 5 p. 92-94.
<http://www.csu.edu.au/learning/eubios/EJ54H.html>

Hyland, G.J The Physiological and Environmental Effects of Non-ionising Electromagnetic Radiation, *Presentation in the European Parliament on 11 July 2001*

International Institute of Biophysics, Kapellner Straße, ehem. Raketenstation,D-41472 NEUSS-HOLZHEIM, Germany.

University of Warwick, Department of Physics, COVENTRY, CV4 7AL, England.

http://carolinelucasmep.org.uk/publications/pdfs_and_word/STOA.doc

Maisch, D. The ICNIRP Guidelines: RF risk assessment built on a house of cards 20/5/2005

http://www.emfacts.com/papers/icnirp_critique.pdf

Maisch. D. Conflict of Interest and Bias in Health Advisory Committees:

A case study of the WHO's EMF Task Group. *JACNEM* 2006 Apr; Vol. 21 (1): 15-17.

http://www.emfacts.com/papers/who_conflict.pdf

----- Original Message -----

From: [Next-up: Contact](#)

To: ['Krzysztof Kuklinski'](#)

Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 1:36 PM

Subject: RE: Next-up news n°272 Santé Health : Clusters Antennes relais / Mobile Mast.

Hello,

The WHO factsheets are of no interest to anyone in Europe any more,
they all are skewed because the WHO is completely under influence of the industry (ICNIRP).

Since Repacholi joined the WHO, it has been of worldwide public notoriety that the WHO's

project studies of the effects of EMF on humans have stopped being credible.

What interests people on the ground is the obvious reality.

The scandal of the century is the ten year WHO EMF cancer cluster project, which cost \$. 258 million, ([Melbourne](#)).

The WHO must change its ways, the lessons that should have been learned from the scandal of the tobacco industry were unfortunately not considered.

If WHO does not change, it will have to be replaced by another world health organization.

Concerning Repacholi personally, then he has betrayed and dirtied the World Health Organization by compromising their obligations to the health of humanity with ties to, and payments from the Industry.

Justice would have been to act with precaution, now we wish for re-examination of the facts.

Thank you very much for your message.

Yours sincerely

Next-up/Serge Sargentini

Bonjour,

Ces écrits de l'OMS n'intéressent plus personne en Europe, ils sont tous biaisés car totalement sous la pression de l'industrie (ICNIRP).

Depuis que Repacholi est passé à l'OMS, il est de notoriété publique mondiale que l'OMS n'est plus crédible sur l'étude des effets de CEM sur l'humain.

Ce qui intéresse les gens c'est l'évidence de la réalité sur le terrain.

L'OMS n'a jamais réalisé un cluster sérieux sur le terrain avec 258 millions de \$, [c'est le scandale du siècle \(Melbourne\)](#).

L'OMS doit changer, le scandale du tabac ne lui a malheureusement pas servi de leçon.

Si l'OMS ne change pas, alors il doit être remplacé par un autre organisme mondial de santé.

Concernant l'individu Repacholi, il a trahi et sali l'Organisation Mondiale de la Santé de part les conséquences de ses actes.

La justice devait agir, il devrait y avoir requalifications des faits, c'est ce que nous souhaitons.

Merci beaucoup de votre message.

Bien à vous

Next-up/Serge Sargentini

De : Krzysztof Kuklinski

Envoyé : mardi 7 août 2007 21:22

À : Next-up news

Objet : Re: Next-up news n°272 Santé / Health : Clusters Antennes relais / Mobile Mast.

Thanks,

There are links to new WHO materials for powerlines:

<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs322/en/index.html>

http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/elf_ehc/en/index.html

Kind regards

Krzysztof Kuklinski

www.kamionki.snap.pl

Next-up news <noreply@next-up.org> wrote:

Si cette page ne s'affiche pas correctement, [cliquez ici](#) / If this page is not posted correctly, [click here](#)

Diffusez, Disseminate Information.



- Daily Mail 07 Aout 2007 : [Santé, Orange va enlever les antennes relais de la "tour du sort des malheureux", où les taux de cancers ont augmenté.](#)
- TimesOnline : [Clusters de cancers près des antennes relais.](#)

- Daily Mail 7 August 2007 : [Health, Orange to remove mobile mast from 'tower of doom', where cancer rate has soared.](#)
 - Times Online : [Cancer clusters at phone masts.](#)
- Toutes les Next-up News / All Next-up News : www.next-up.org/NewsOftheworld/All.php



[Envoyer](#) à un ami
[Send](#) to a friend

Next-up news : [REGISTER](#) / [Click here](#) to unregister