

Sent: Saturday, November 01, 2008 11:14 AM
Subject: RE: La révision de l'ombudsman

Nov. 1, 2008

Ariel

I'm glad that we "won" our main point that the Decouverte program was biased and lacked balance. However, I am concerned that Mme Miville-Dechêne missed a major point we were trying to make. The majority of mainstream scientists do not see any evidence of harm from cell phones or WiFi radiation. She seems to have completely missed this important point. Mme Miville-Dechêne, mentions the WHO, and almost dismisses them as just another scientific "opinion". I think she bases her view largely on the Economist article that we gave her (see the extracts below).

She does not mention other major organizations including the FDA, the American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute, and the CDC whose statements we gave her. In fact, in all of our research, we have not come across a single major public health organization that recognizes any harmful effects. During our meeting, I made the point that the alarmist portion of the scientific community represents a minority view, just as skeptical climate change skeptics are a minority.

Her report contains a number of serious errors and omissions from the extensive documentation that we gave her. I've extracted a number of quotes from her report with comments based on the data that we gave her.

P. 7 1st full paragraph: "Havas devenait purement explicatif puisqu'elle montrait comment calculer les niveaux d'émission. Ces explications ne nécessitaient pas de contrepartie." I don't understand how Mme Miville-Dechêne can say this. Havas didn't do any calculations, we did. In our meeting with her, we spent a fair amount of time explaining how the measurements of the RF levels with the HF35 meter were highly misleading. I explained to her that the difference in units of measurement in meters squared vs centimeters squared is a factor of 10,000. Therefore all of the alarmist measurements by Havas were "safe", even by her preposterous definition.

P. 7 last paragraph: " Le journaliste Michel Rochon estime, et il n'est pas le seul, que l'avis de l'OMS est contestable, car aucune étude ne confirme l'absence de danger des antennes." It is impossible to prove a negative.
However, we did give her studies, such as the Danish cell phone study of 420,000 users that found no harmful effects.

P. 9 last paragraph: "Le rédacteur en chef Pierre Sormany précise que les études passées, dites par provocation, sont contestables en raison de leur méthodologie : en exposant les sujets pendant quelques minutes aux champs électromagnétiques, on ne peut pas mesurer les effets à long terme. Pierre Sormany et Michel Rochon ont une connaissance du

dossier qui leur permet de mettre en doute l'avis de l'OMS.." I gave Mme Miville-Dechêne one of the double blind studies on EHS individuals that disproves this claim by Sormany. I explained to her that the EHS individuals had first been tested with exposures sufficiently long to report symptoms (they were told the RF source was "on"). When the same exposures were repeated double blind, they did no better than chance. Furthermore it is outrageous to claim that the producers have a better understanding of these studies than the WHO. She also mentions that EHS is recognized in Sweden. This is a political decision, not a scientific one. It's like saying that because the teaching of creationism is sanctioned in Kansas, that this carries scientific weight.

P. 10 3rd paragraph: " Dans un reportage antérieur, Michel Rochon a rencontré en Suède les scientifiques qui ont observé en laboratoire les bris d'ADN et les dommages aux chromosomes. C'est certainement inquiétant, mais le fardeau de la preuve en science est plus exigeant que cela." Mme Miville-Dechêne completely ignores the article we gave her which shows that the author of the major study on DNA breakage has been accused of scientific fraud. Other major studies, such as the one we gave her testing the expression of 22,000 genes in human cells found absolutely nothing.

P. 10 4th paragraph: " Dans un article de la revue The Economist du 25 septembre 2008, intitulé Mobile Madness, on rapporte la profusion d'études contradictoires sur les présumés dangers du cellulaire." Mme Miville-Dechêne puts a lot of weight on this article from the Economist that we gave her.

However, I believe this article overstates the degree of division in the scientific community over this issue. This article was published based on a conference organized by the alarmist portion of the scientific community.

Such a conference is bound to be highly skewed - one has only to look at the titles of the talks that were presented and the names of the majority of the presenters. Nonetheless, the Economist managed to write a reasonably balanced piece, even if they overstated the "division" in the overall scientific community. Mme Miville-Dechêne should have contact Dr. Michael Thun of the American Cancer Society, or Dr. Michel Plante of Hydro Quebec for a better sense of mainstream science.

I suggest that you write back or contact Mme Miville-Dechêne with our comments on her report. I think she should have called us back before writing this report to clear up her confusion.

Regards,

Lorne