

ARTHUR W. GUY, Ph.D.
18122 60th PL NE
Kenmore, Washington 98028
Phone (425) 486-6439 • Fax (425) 485-5963
E-Mail gbemc@comcast.com

March 17, 2005

Louis Slesin
Microwave News
155 East 77th Street
Suite 3D, New York, NY 10021

Louis:

I am enraged and shocked by the rude and blatant untruth you wrote about me in your March 11, 2005 Web edition of Microwave News. Though I vowed in the depths of my retirement from the University of Washington to no longer respond to the extreme nonsense that is circulating in the media, this piece is so bad that it forces me to respond. The statements you used to slander my name and impugn my character are absolutely untrue! I most vehemently and unequivocally deny that I, or any body that I am aware of, made any calls to NIH or to Dr. Michael Galvin to influence in any way the activities of NIH and its peer review study section members in analyzing and approving Dr. Henry Lai's grant. I would never carry out such an abhorrent unethical communication that would violate the rules of a federal agency. At the time of the alleged call, Dr. Lai was a friend and colleague running the laboratory that had been left in his hands after my retirement a few years before. I had wished him great success in this endeavor and did nothing to interfere with his work.

I have served on and chaired many NIH Study Section meetings, have written many grant applications and have been awarded many grants from NIH over a good part of my professional career. NIH must follow the advice of the peer review study section members with priorities for funding determined by scores assigned by those members. Outside interests could not have an effect on an award. Any phone call to someone like Dr. Galvin would not affect the outcome. Further, any member of the study section from the same institute as the applicant or with any other type of conflict of interest must leave during all discussions and scoring of that application. The fact that you concocted this unbelievable story of my alleged attempt to influence the process makes it obvious that you know little about the NIH process.

At the time of the alleged call to Dr. Galvin, the Science Advisory Group that later was called WTR was in the process of defining studies to test the biological effects of simulated cell phone signals. Dr. Lai's lab was one of the potential

resources for carrying out such work. Any adverse influence on Lai's work by me would be against my interest as well as WTR's interest.

It is clear that you have not taken even the first step that any responsible journalist would take to independently verify your information before publication. To clear my name, I called Henry to learn how and where his allegation could have originated. I learned that he had long suspected me of making such a call. He had not informed me of his suspicions at any time in ten years. Lai told me, as he evidently must have previously told you, that the information about this alleged incident came from Dr. Galvin. Henry said that he thought it had to be me who made a call because I was the only one who knew of his research and that I personally knew Dr. Galvin. I began to wonder whether Henry had actually heard my name or not. I became deeply concerned at how these surreptitious, outrageous allegations were being passed from one party to the next over ten years without any verification of the facts or anyone giving me the courtesy of asking for my response. With growing concern I continued the quest for clearing my name by pursuing what any responsible journalist should have done before the piece in question was written: I sent an E-mail to Dr. Galvin. He sent me the following reply:

I do not remember any call concerning this grant from outside interests. If there is an issue, you should contact NIEHS and have them review the grant file. If there was an investigation (which I do not remember), documentation would be in the file. My only recollection is that there may have been some issues raised in the peer review and these were addressed by the PI. I do not have a clear recollection of the grant as it has been some years.

Now that I have (hopefully) responded to the phone call issue, let me go back to the real issue that started all of this which you, if on the ball, would have seen as the root cause of Henry's problem. Let me go to your last sentence in your diatribe. You state:

Guy's first impulse on hearing about some important new experimental finding that questioned the safety of a product that would soon be responsible for exposing more than a billion people to a constant stream of RF radiation was to blow the whistle and try to impugn Lai.

As I mentioned earlier in this message there was no phone call from me nor was I trying to impugn Lai. The first experimental finding that Lai reported to support the beginning of his media blitz against cell phones was not new at all. It was based on an old study of the effect of microwave pulse exposures on rat behavior that he and I had published 3 years earlier. I had developed the exposure system and was responsible for the dosimetry. The study was designed to test the effects of high power radar exposure on the health of rats. No way did the experiment apply to cellular phone exposure. I was startled when my former

colleague Henry appeared on the local TV news in 1997, indicating he had found that cellular phone emissions can cause rats to forget. The next day I called Henry and asked him what experiment that was. When I found out it was the one with my name as co-author that was reported in the 1994 paper relating to radar research, I explained to Henry the difference between cell phone signals and radar signals and that he should do something to correct the misinformation. He did not correct the misinformation or lack of key exposure information in his later public statements regarding the 1994 paper nor his later studies on behavior or DNA damage. As the one responsible for the dosimetry and applicability of the research results to various sources of exposure in our publications, I told Henry that if he was not going to correct his erroneous interpretations on the applicability to cell phones that I had a public duty to set the record straight. This was done several weeks after my discussion with Henry with his full knowledge of my intentions. The key information missing from previous press stories concerning the paper was reported by Jeffrey Silva of RCR News on September 29, 1997:

Guy said the biggest difference between the 1994 experiment and their applicability to cellular phones is that testing involved whole body exposure to radar-like emissions of 500 microwave pulses per second with peak powers that were several thousand times higher than that possible from cellular phones.

Louis, you have made very serious charges based on erroneous or unverifiable information that, if it has not already, threatens to impugn a reputation that has taken me a lifetime to build. You have done it again. Shot from the hip with faulty information and sloppy work. You know it all comes back to haunt you in the end. Fewer and fewer people believe your words with each passing year.

I challenge you to retract your libelous allegations about me in your March 11, 2005 edition of Microwave News and post my response. I demand that you make a public apology to clear my name.

Bill Guy, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
University of Washington

cc: Michael Galvin
Henry Lai
University of Washington Alumni Magazine