>>> ALERT:  1998 - DOCUMENT REVEALED:  People Intentionally COOKED by Frequencies - EMF Standards for Safety Based on "Consensus" not Real Science  - Inaugural Round Table on World EMF Standards Harmonization Minutes of Meeting, 18 November 1998
>>>
>>> NOTE - this document was not issued to the general public . . .
>>>
>>> MOST IMPORTANT - Global corporations are fabricating conclusions where the public is led to believe that the corporate operations  provide safety standards, i.e. food, EMF electromagnetic safety standards for human biological systems, safe drinking levels of fluoride, and telling us small amounts of toxins in the vaccines are wellness enhancements.  Their meetings are not for public comment because when you speak they will say we need to get through our presentation without further interruptions, and we will take public comment at the end.  The end for public comment does not arrive and the meeting ends  These agendas are destroying livelihoods with all the rules, codes and statutes and they do not represent the PEOPLE . . .
>>>
>>> Inaugural Round Table on World EMF Standards Harmonization Minutes of Meeting, 18 November 1998
>>>
>>> [http://www.nrk.no/contentfile/file/1.6231930!zagreb.pdf](http://www.nrk.no/contentfile/file/1.6231930%21zagreb.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)
>>>
>>> You will note the following are a few of the intentions of a stealth global corporate manipulation to create standards the corporations say are intended to be safe when the standards are used for injury, to create illnesses which benefit the corporate profits of big pharma and other stakeholders and corporate agencies . . As long as America is under a permanent state of national emergency, that has been on going since 1933, the Constitution has been suspended and our government is implementing corporate statutes through the executive branch by way of executive orders.
>
>>>
>>> International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection - ICNIRP
>>>
>>> NOTE:  The ICNIRP conducted its conferences using the DELPHI Program as illustrated below -  What do we mean by the DELPHI and how did the ICNIRP use this technique?  As you read the description here are the factors that surface at ALL corporate Delphi meetings, globally.  They say there have conferences and workshops that are widely attended.  That these workshops result in draft guidelines and are posted online for public review and comment before finalization and or publication. . We have witnessed first hand that public comment is not utilized in the final documents. . The meetings are run by trained facilitators who manipulate the pubic into thinking they have participated by designing the questions to get the desired outcomes that were predetermined . . .  Research the Delphi Technique for yourself to understand this "trap" that has effectively maneuvered and advanced the illusion of public input resulting in predatory and dangerous global corporate agendas that are being adopted causing immeasurable destruction and death.  We recommend you read "The Great American Adventure - Secrets of America" and "THE MATRIX - and the U.S. Constitution" by retired Judge Dale a free download on www.StopTheCrime.net
>>>
>>> The paragraph below came from wikipedia and lays out the Delphi Technique when you know what to look for -
>>> "ICNIRP is widely connected to a large community working on non-ionizing radiation protection around the world. Its conferences and workshops are widely attended. ICNIRP presents its draft guidelines online for public review and comment before publication. It has ties to IRPA and is formally recognized by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Office (ILO) as partners in the field of non-ionizing radiation.[2] Its advice is requested by many national and multinational organizations such as the European Union (EU). Standard bodies also refer to ICNIRP health protection guidance for setting appliance standards."
>>>
>>> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International\_Commission\_on\_Non-Ionizing\_Radiation\_Protection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Commission_on_Non-Ionizing_Radiation_Protection%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)
>>>
>>> To illustrate the above effectively applied Delphi practice used by the ICNIRP read the excerpt on page 8 top paragraph of the EMF report - "The government had "insisted" on the use of peer reviewed information like ICNIRP is establishing the ordinance which has provided for safe operations and has been accepted by the highest courts.  There is every intention to consider and incorporate EU and WHO recommendations as they are developed further."
>>>
>>> Page 6 Item 11 -  Note:  There is some pressure to introduce a NEW SAFETY FACTOR of 10 for "NEW SYSTEMS", BUT THIS IS POLITICALLY motivated.  Our comment:  Since when did safty issues become political?
>>>
>>> Dr. Bernhardt noted that the reference levels MAY be used for most situations but the basic restrictions may need to be applied to deal with certain specific situations such as cell phones . . .
>>>
>>> Page 5 - Item 5 - The group is looking into new means of incorporating contact currents into the standards and investigating issues of compatibility to allow for "operations across international boundaries".
>>>
>>> Page 7 - Item 11- It is clear that the new limits will have to be in harmony with the EU and in the longer term with other countries world-wide.
>>>
>>>
>>> COMMENTS from StopTheCrime.net - the EMF document with excerpts is posted below this comment . . .
>>> It is MOST important to understand this report was based upon controlled and manipulated international corporate meeting protocols, called the Delphi Technique", which in this report Delphi was used to reach a global consensus for "safe" EMF Standards . . . Consensus is NOT science based . . The controlling global corporate construct uses the corporate meeting format called the Delphi Technique to conduct and obtain their desired meeting outcomes that are most profitable for the corporations. . . We are in an extremely predatory global corporate structure and we can NO longer trust or rely upon the conclusions made by these for-profit private corporations.  These corporations are not representative governments and they do not represent our best interests.  No CORPORATE agency is responsible or held liable for the EMF injuries, they are exempt of liability through the co-opted corporate Judiciary system that does not serve us either.  Ever notice when we use actual science to counter the consensus for the EMF safety levels the corporate agencies use baseless studies and side step the issue? . . . We have a counterfeit government waging war upon the people and EMF Electromagnetic Frequencies is a medical time bomb.  Our lives are being traded for corporate profits wherein life has no value . .  The WHO (Rockefeller and Rothschild) was established to create a false sense of global safety that we the PEOPLE were being "cared" for. We found out the real purpose!  We can no longer trust medical authorities or the medical literature that is produced by corporate interests for corporate profits - our system has been bought off and we have been sold out to the highest bidders.  Real science does not support the corporate interests and real scientific literature and studies are ignored for profits.  The corporations do not profit by supporting health and keeping people safe and out of harms way.  To the contrary that's why the corporations lack safety standards - and that is why toxins in our food, water, air, vaccines, etc. are LEGAL . . The corporate agencies sponsoring the EMF studies can NO longer be trusted when we know the studies are "rigged" and set-up to show desired outcomes for profit. . . CONSENSUS conclusions are NOT science based conclusions - consensus is politically based. . .  The endgame is disturbing, and without a media to report the TRUTH and hold the system accountable we will continue to witness the crushing consequences of illness and eventual early death of the global human family.  The media and our reporting network has been bought off . . . When a lie is repeated often enough the lie will become the truth . . . WE MUST NOW CONSIDER OUR OPTIONS - The future injuries from EMF electromagnetic frequencies, radio waves and all the wireless communication devices that will cause cell damage and cell death is a gigantic corporate cover-up for corporate profit and to reduce the population . . . We MUST EXPOSE these crimes even though we are out monied and ignored or personally attacked - WE MUST NOT CONSENT!
>>>
>>> WE MUST LIVE IN RIGHT CONDUCT and NOT LIVE IN FEAR!
>>>
>>> NOTE - this document is not issued to the general public . . . and is based upon a Political CONSENSUS resulting from the Corporate Delphi Meeting Program set up by the Rand Corporation in the 1960's . . .
>>
>>> CONSENSUS:  Idealistic approach in which it is considered that an individual can verify nothing except their own experience of the world, and can never directly know the truth of the world independent of that . . . Consensus implies general agreement although not necessarily unanimity - unanimity does not constitute absolute agreement.
>>>
>>> Inaugural Round Table on World EMF Standards Harmonization Minutes of Meeting, 18 November 1998
>>>
>>> [http://www.nrk.no/contentfile/file/1.6231930!zagreb.pdf](http://www.nrk.no/contentfile/file/1.6231930%21zagreb.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)
>>>
>>> Page !
>>> Introduction - The International EMF Project was established by WHO in 1996 in order to address concerns about possible health effects from EMFs. It is collaborating with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), the International Labour Office (ILO), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Commission (EC), over 40 governmental agencies and the following WHO Collaborating Centres: the National Radiological Protection Board, UK; the Bundesamt für Strahelnschutz, Germany; the Karolinska Institute, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Sweden; the Food and Drug Administration, USA; the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, USA; the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, USA; and the National Institute for Environment studies, Japan .
>>> It had become evident that since the late 1950s and early 1960s when the first standards and guidelines began to be discussed there has developed an increasing variety in the approaches taken by various national and international authorities and agencies to the drafting of standards and guidelines. In order to facilitate the harmonization of EMF standards, the International EMF Project initiated this activity at its inaugural meeting in Zagreb. At this first meeting, the purpose was to assess points of similarity and difference and identify steps to be taken to resolve any apparent or substantive differences.
>>>
>>> Page 2  - the WHO does "not" set EMF Standards.
>>>
>>> Page 13 - The WHO's initiative to develop a framework for internationally acceptable standards will greatly assist ICNIRP in drafting its next EMF guidelines on exposure limits. . (The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), a formally recognized NGO non-governmental organization of the WHO, that drafts international EMF standards will also participate in this initiative to "harmonize" global EMF standards based on consensus which is NOT science.)
>>>
>>> Page 3
>>>
>>> Dr Allen (NRPB) noted that despite its claim of being international by virtue of its having members in countries around the world, IEEE did not appear to be accepted outside the US or mandated even within the US Dr Leonowich noted that first, the ANSI/IEEE standard had been adopted by the US DoD and is thereby mandatory among the armed services. Second, the US FCC is required to follow some parts. And third, the occupational exposure guidelines embodied in the TLVs of the ACGIH were derived from the ANSI/IEEE standard. However, in the end, there is not actually a mandated standard over all of the US
>>>
>>> Page 4
>>> 3.    Dr James Lin spoke on the subject of the NCRP Standard and as Chairman of its Scientific Committee 8-95. He noted that the NCRP is a non-profit corporation chartered by the US Congress in the mid-1960s. Members and participants in NCRP activities work in subgroups of experts but finally all reports have to be approved by the full membership (currently over 100 members and 70 organizations) of the council. NCRP Report 86 published in the mid-1980s for the first time recognized dosimetric methods. It saw the adoption of SA and SAR, included the first two-tier system incorporating a factor of 5 reduction for exposures to members of the public and time averaging recommendations. The ongoing work of Scientific Committee 8-95 had started in 1995 and was still in progress. Among items under review was exposure assessment, particularly related to the eye, the ear, epidemiological studies and medical applications. There was a considerable amount of scientific work on DNA and gene expression, cancer induction and promotion, amplitude, power, or frequency windows, and modulated fields.
>>> In response to a question about the basis for standards in the US and the degree of co- operation between NCRP, ANSI/IEEE and ACGIH, Dr Lin noted that NCRP assembled the basic database from which recommendations were derived by NCRP to assist other US standards setting organizations in establishing their limits.
>>> 4.    Dr Jürgen Bernhardt, speaking on behalf of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), noted that their recommendations had been published in the April 1998 issue of Health Physics. There, a risk assessment had also been carried out, not taking into account social or economic considerations. Such considerations are the responsibility of national governments. The guidelines were based on health risk assessments published in WHO Environmental Health Criteria documents and more recent studies. The guidelines incorporate safety factors varying from about 2 to more than 10, depending on frequency, and flexibility to cover many exposure situations. For practical application of the guidelines, reference levels were provided to determine compliance with the basic restrictions.    While recent work may indicate problems associated with near fields or inhomogeneous fields, it is not anticipated that there will be any revision for some 5 to 6 years, probably not until after the conclusion of the WHO EMF Project's health risk assessments.
>>> When asked whether the reference levels were to be used as limits, Dr Bernhardt noted that the reference levels MAY be used for most situations but the basic restrictions may need to be applied to deal with certain specific situations such as cell phones.
>>> It was noted from the floor that the literature suggests cell phones are very near to producing exposures exceeding recommended limits. Consequently, should ICNIRP not be considering an update sooner than in 5 to 6 years? Dr Bernhardt responded that no part of the head was subject to temperature rises in excess of 0.1 or 0.2 C. Further, there is no scientific evidence of other effects not associated with temperature rises. Consequently, there is no need to rush the current review process.
>>>
>>> Page 5
>>> 5.    Dr Jon Klauenberg reviewed the standards activities within NATO over the past 20 years. During the past 6 years there had been a great deal of work toward harmonization which had culminated on 13 October 1997 with the promulgation of STANAG 2345 which is the NATO RFR personnel protection guideline. A new edition has the status of a MINIMAL safety standard, meaning any participating nation may have stricter guidelines. The group is looking into new means of incorporating contact currents into the standards and investigating issues of compatibility to allow for operations across international boundaries.
>>> In the context of US federal agencies, Dr Klauenberg noted that the agencies are required to follow newly established Public Law 104-113 known as the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA - 1995). The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised its guidance on federal agency standardization practices to emphasize the NTTAA - 1995 requirement that non-governmental consensus standards be used wherever possible. The OMB - A119 also require