

## **Problem**

Are there safeguards when harmful electromagnetic fields cause physical harm?

## **Concise Response**

When powerful radiofrequency (RF) emitters are re-purposed and applied to commit malice, civil society does not yet provide safeguards (public policy on harassment, diagnostic/forensic tests, statutes/code factor re-engineered RF emitter of high potency re-engineered for intentional physical injury).

## **Detailed Response**

When electronic devices that provide positive benefit to society by harnessing powerful RF (household microwave oven, outdoor high power unidirectional microwave transceivers performing point to point wireless communication) are exploited by salvaging the components emitting powerful RF (Magnetron, outdoor beam-forming microwave transmitter respectively) which are then placed in an electronic circuit to function as a weapon (expertise in electronic circuit design/fabrication gets one started) and applied for malice, a victim in civil society is unsuspecting and defenseless since majority do not recognize the leading indicators of failing health exposed to harmful RF. This concern for lack of public safety safeguards would be void if (a) there were life science diagnostic/forensic tests to detect biomarkers expressed post-overexposure to harmful RF, (b) statutes/code pertinent to physical assault/trespass, antitrust, extortion and possibly others recognized improvisation/re-purposing of common sources emitting powerful RF as a method of everyday crime, (c) harassment policy (similar to discrimination types based on typical stereotypes) statement were published on notice boards that gave notice of penal implications when powerful RF is used for hate/retaliation/mobbing etc. and (d) powerful RF emitters (eg. Magnetron) were designed with an electro-mechanical feature to neutralize the powerful RF emitter (ie. get bricked) when removed from their original manufacturer's device housing (eg. household microwave oven).

Targeting a victim by placing a re-purposed/improvised powerful RF emitter in an innocuous place at a place of work/recuperation makes this a compelling type of technology misuse in need of risk mitigation considering (a) RF passes through typical building materials with insignificant attenuation\*, (b) unlike a visible energy source like fire which alerts our sense of caution, most of us are unaware of failing health post-overexposure to powerful RF, (c) integration of advanced signal processing provides visibility\*\* to a victim in spite of intervening opaque building\* barriers and (d) the health of a decision-maker in industry or government and other walks of life can be held for ransom\*\*\* using this method since methods to detect/test overexposure to harmful RF are absent. Consequently, the decision-maker is vulnerable to feign interest of the common good to protect one's own (or kin or pet) health degraded by harmful RF.

## **Reference**

\* Stone WC. Electromagnetic Signal Attenuation in Construction Materials. In: NIST Interagency/Internal Report -6055. 1 Oct 1997.

\*\* Ling H, Ram S. "Detecting Human Activities Through Barriers: Doppler Radar Signals Become Animation".[www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/09/080925094719.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/09/080925094719.htm).

\*\*\* Sir William Stewart. Power Density: Radio frequency Non-Ionizing Radiation. In: Mobile Phones and Health: A report from the Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones, (The Stewart Report,2000).

[https://www.ofcom.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0019/62515/cavi\\_society\\_attachment.pdf](https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/62515/cavi_society_attachment.pdf). This report presents the types of negative health observed in animal/avian models post-overexposure to harmful RF. It is just a matter of experimentation to modify the radiated RF power and/or duration of exposure to invoke the same negative health effects in humans as observed in animal/avian models.