

VIEWS ON THE NEWS

How To Do Science: Löscher Teaches Americans a Lesson

We should all thank Germany's Wolfgang Löscher for reminding us what science is really about: Testing ideas until you understand what is going on.

Ten years ago, Löscher and Meike Mevissen began publishing a series of papers that upset the prevailing paradigm by showing that relatively weak magnetic fields can promote breast cancer in laboratory animals.

This is important. Evidence of an EMF effect on animals is the missing link. With it, the epidemiological evidence pointing to a cancer risk would be much more credible.

NIEHS' Gary Boorman asked Battelle's Larry Anderson to repeat Löscher's work. His first two experiments went awry. A third attempt found no effect.

Boorman dismissed Löscher's work as flawed and went on to wage a campaign to discredit Löscher, even resorting to dirty tricks.

Instead of turning tail as so many others have done when confronted by an angry EMF establishment, Löscher went back to the lab and ran more experiments. He collaborated with Anderson and together they explored why their results disagreed.

Now, four years later, Löscher thinks he has the answer. As his postdoc Maren Fedrowitz explained at the June BEMS meet-

Dr. Li's Chorus of Critics

Last year when we first reported De-Kun Li's innovative study linking miscarriages to a new metric—maximum magnetic field exposure—we predicted that it would not soon be followed up (see *MWN*, M/J01). But we never dreamt that it would be attacked so fiercely.

Sir Richard Doll and his NRPB colleagues called the results essentially worthless and said that they do not warrant a second look (see p.3). The electric utility industry and BEMS wasted no time before circulating Doll's harsh opinion. At EPRI, Rob Kavet lip-synchs Li's critics when not prevaricating about his own activities.

Much too much protesting is going on, which suggests only one thing: Li is on to something after all.

ing: Animals with different genetic makeups respond differently to EMFs (see p.2).

EMF research is plagued with unreplicated results because there is never enough money, persistence and curiosity to resolve apparent contradictions. The significance of genetic variability emerged in the Henhouse Project 15 years ago, but it was ignored because it, too, challenged the orthodoxy.

Löscher has shown us that EMF enigmas can be explained—if one behaves like a scientist.

Motorola's Junkyard Dog

It was an ugly scene. Motorola's Joe Morrissey came to the microphone after Dariusz Leszczynski's talk at the BEMS meeting and asked if he had read the epidemiological and animal studies showing that mobile phone radiation has no health effects. If so, he wondered, why was Leszczynski speculating about microwave-induced cancer risks and leakage through the blood-brain barrier (see p.10).

"Are you aware of these studies?" Morrissey demanded to know. There was a moment of stunned silence before Leszczynski responded that of course he was. "I should have answered, 'Yes, I can read,'" he later told us.

Motorola is the single most important force in bioelectromagnetics today. It is the largest sponsor of health research, both on its own and through the Mobile Manufacturers Forum, and it controls key positions on standard-setting committees and professional societies such as BEMS. Motorola has a big say about what papers are published, what standards are adopted and what meetings are held—it even decides what news is sent to BEMS members.

But as the Morrissey episode illustrates, there is more than science on Motorola's agenda. The company has never shied away from spinning research results. Remember how its PR people "war-gamed" the Lai-Singh results? (See *MWN*, J/F97.)

Too often, Motorola takes the position that experimental results from labs it sponsors are always right and that conflicting

findings must be wrong. Henry Lai and N.P. Singh saw DNA breaks in rat brains following microwave exposure, but Joe Roti Roti did not. Motorola says you have to believe Roti Roti.

Whether discouraging China from adopting a tough new SAR standard or pushing for looser microwave exposure limits in the U.S. or arguing that putative nonthermal effects must be due to heating, Mays Swicord, C.K. Chou and Joe Elder want us to believe that their opinions are based on science and only on science.

It's a tough sell. Morrissey is their attack dog and his nasty performance at the BEMS meeting tells us a lot about Motorola's real agenda: to discredit any data that could hurt the market for mobile phones.

By the way, we wonder whether Morrissey is aware of Ross Adey's animal study showing that digital phone radiation can protect against cancer. He should be. Motorola sponsored it.

MICROWAVE NEWS is published bimonthly. • ISSN 0275-6595 • PO Box 1799, Grand Central Station, New York, NY 10163 • (212) 517-2800; Fax: (212) 734-0316; E-mail: <mwn@pobox.com>; Web: <www.microwavenews.com> • Editor and Publisher: Louis Slesin, PhD; Managing Editor: Douglas Barnes, PhD; Editorial Assistant: Danielle Catalano; Consulting Editor: Jon Swan; Copy Editor: Roy Thomas Jr. • Subscriptions: \$325.00 per year (\$350.00 Canada & Foreign, U.S. funds only); Single copies: \$60.00 • Copyright © 2002 by Louis Slesin • Reproduction is forbidden without written permission.
