

DIRTY ELECTRICITY IS TAKING AWAY OUR BREASTS

Why is it that an associate professor submits testimonies on behalf of women for court cases in Canada reporting how a dirty electrical environment can cause breast cancer in the workplace yet women continue to remain uninformed on the involvement of dirty electricity?

Dirty Electricity (DE) is taking away women's breasts with working at computers a large part of the problem as computers create dirty electricity and the harmful current from computers flows through the sensitive breast tissue. The rise of the computer age has definitely played a role in the dramatic rise of breast cancer cases since the 1970s.

When 3 men developed breast cancer in one small office in their workplace, the expert witness for the men testified that their breast cancers were caused in part at least by the electromagnetic fields (EMFs) emanating from an electrical vault next to where the men worked. On analysis of the many studies that have been conducted in regard to these EMFs and males, the breast cancer association between these fields and male breast cancer is supported.

Breast cancer today affects 1 in 7 women yet when individual cases of breast cancer or breast cancer clusters in women occur, various reproductive factors are also taken into account which makes it easier to discount role that EMFs play in causing breast cancer.

Are our experts really so uninformed or is it because breast cancer affects so many women that the information is so widely resisted with workplace investigation conclusions of 'random change' and 'coincidence' occurring world-wide?

It is estimated less than 10% of breast cancer cases are due to inherited gene mutations. It is estimated that 70% of breast cancer cases are not due to the current known/acknowledged risk factors. Risk factors do not cause breast cancer though. So what is causing or triggering breast cancer? Any agent that: alters the body's natural production of hormones - estrogen and melatonin in particular; damages our genes; and prevents the ability of our cells to interact in an orderly fashion. EMFs have been shown to: reduce melatonin levels which results in 'ovary constant estrogen'; change the way in which DNA works and breaks (the carcinogens in cigarette smoke creates DNA breaks), interrupt the signalling systems of our cells.

It is critical that our exposure to dirty electricity be reduced. It is very much a concern when the important papers documenting the effect these EMFs have on the hormone melatonin and the drug Tamoxifen were left out in the WHO EMF Project - a 365-page document with over 1000 references.

When Professor Bruce Armstrong who led the breast cancer cluster investigation at the ABC TV studios, Brisbane, was questioned on national television in August

2007 on the frustration of some of the women who felt that the proper investigations were not carried out before all the equipment was taken out, he admitted: "It is very important to do the investigations properly, and indeed we did have a problem with the ABC with the fairly quick decision to remove people from the site. It did mean that some of the measurements we wanted to do were not complete, and I do understand how the women feel in that respect; they don't feel that it's been done satisfactorily..."ⁱ This is just not good enough when so many lives are at stake world-wide.

In 2008 it was reported that there were 108 breast cancer clusters in the USA with another currently in San Diego. In Australia, currently I am aware of breast cancer cluster occurrences at the ABC TV studios Brisbane, Concord Hospital Sydney, Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital Adelaide, in Gin Gin Western Australia, a possible breast cancer cluster at Sydney Airport and many other locations where I have been informed by women who are worried but are too scared to bring attention to it for fear of losing their employment. Also, many women are in breast cancer clusters and unaware of it.

It was virtually impossible for a woman in the South of the United States of America in the 1940s to develop breast cancer but when she moved to a city that had electricity her risk increased. These cancer clusters serve to show us what is happening silently on a daily basis in everyone's lives.

Today it is quite widely accepted that the electromagnetic fields (EMFs) from electricityⁱⁱ can cause childhood leukaemia. (The reason why childhood leukaemia has been studied is because the strongest evidence for a cancer is that the same cancer is significantly elevated in children). The WHO conservatively classified these EMFs as a Class 2b carcinogen in 2001 based on 6 epidemiological studies for childhood leukaemia.

Why is it though, that authorities continue to resist so heavily the contention that EMFs can cause breast cancer? There are 18 epidemiological studies (not 6 as in the case of leukaemia), showing an increased risk of breast cancer with occupational EMF exposure and unlike for childhood leukaemia where experimental studies neither support nor refute the association the magnetic fields, for breast cancer experimental studies (both *in vivo* and *in vitro*) show a *cause and effect* relationship and point to possible mechanisations of action which leukaemia does not.ⁱⁱⁱ

Also of concern is women returning to the same workplace or working at computers again while receiving treatment, recovering or returning to the workplace as a survivor of breast cancer. Women's requests to change duties to prevent a recurrence of breast cancer should be honoured. In the breast cancer cluster in a Canadian office three women fought for recognition that the workplace caused their breast cancer. Two of the women returned to the workplace and subsequently died. The one who refused to return has survived. We are at the stage where workplace reform is critical. All workplaces, especially call centres - breeding places for breast cancer - should record statistics on breast cancer in present staff and also staff who have left that

particular workplace. It is vital that every female sleeps in an electrically clean environment.

Any study into breast cancer has significant ramifications for all of us. Breast tissue is the most sensitive tissue in the body and the most sensitive to artificial (man-made) radiation. Being a very high risk disease today one would assume that a possible cause of this disease, let alone a probable cause - would be widely disseminated and acted on promptly. Sadly, this is not the case. In a world that wants to lessen or at best eliminate breast cancer, lessening exposure to artificial electromagnetic radiation, which is possible, would be at the very least, a sensible, intelligent and wise decision.

The contention that the fields from electricity can harm has a history replete *particularly in the area of breast cancer* with destroyed careers and tarnished reputations involving scientists who have sought to help the people, and with so-called experts who have colluded with the forces going against the precautionary principle of public health: first, *do no harm*.

In his assessment for the journal of the Royal Institute of Public Health in the UK, Dr Stephen J. Genius reported that vested interests have been effective in delaying restrictive EMF legislation. He also noted that claims of environmental harm have been challenged by researchers who fail to disclose covert ties to industry, that economic interests exert undue influence on medical journals, and that some editors and journal staff have suppressed publication of scientific results that are adverse to the interests of industry.^{iv}

Released in the year 2000 a study of 44,788 sets of twins from Sweden, Denmark and Finland concluded that environmental factors were the initiating event in the majority of cancers.^v The strongest contender and most likely culprit is artificial (man-made) electromagnetic radiation.

All females should be informed as to why we should not voluntarily irradiate our breasts and how not to remain an unsuspecting recipient. Dirty electricity is definitely taking away our breasts.

"...the 20th century epidemic of the so called diseases of civilization including cardiovascular disease, cancer and diabetes and suicide was caused by electrification not by lifestyle. A large proportion of these diseases may therefore be preventable.

Dr Samuel Milham October 2009 Medical Epidemiologist of Occupational Epidemiology MD MPH
Washington State Department of Health, USA

Donna Fisher, based in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, is the chair of Donna Fisher Silent Fields Inc., a non-profit organisation working towards the implementation of legislation against 'dirty electricity' with the aim of protecting people in the workplace. Her model is now being incorporated across the globe, especially in the European Union. She is also CEO of the Donna Fisher Breast Health Initiative, which is committed to *noninvasive* technologies for prevention, detection and cure of breast cancer and supports eliminating the environmental causes of breast cancer with particular focus on chemicals and radiation.

Donna Fisher is the author of *Silent Fields: The Growing Cancer Cluster Story –When Electricity Kills...* released August 2008 and *More Silent Fields: Cancer and the Dirty Electricity Plague – The Missing Link...* released November 2009).

Donna Fisher can be contacted by email at:
donnafisher@silentfields.com and via her website
<http://www.silentfields.com>.

ⁱ Professor Bruce Armstrong, interviewed on *9am with David & Kim*, Channel 10, Australia, August 7, 2007

ⁱⁱ Extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields – ELF EMF

ⁱⁱⁱ Havas M, Report to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Appeals Tribunal, *Breast Cancer and Occupational Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields*, Expert Testimony: Breast Cancer and EMF November 18, 2008 Pages 4-7

^{iv} Genuis SJ, "Fielding a current idea: exploring the public health impact of electromagnetic radiation", *Public Health* 2007, doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2007.04.008

^v Lichtenstein P, Holm NV, Verkasalo PK, Iliadou A, Kaprio J, Koskenvuo M et al., "Environmental and heritable factors in the causation of cancer: Analyses of cohorts of twins from Sweden, Denmark, and Finland", *N Engl J Med* 2000; 343:78-85