When Carrie Bickmore won the Gold Logie for most popular personality last night, her speech was what showed her golden personality. She took the opportunity to raise awareness about **brain cancer**, what took her husband's life a few years ago.

Famous Australian neurosurgeons Dr. Vini Khurana and Dr Charlie Teo raised concerns about mobile phone use as a likely cause years ago. Their peer-reviewed publication in 2009 (Surgical Neurology 72 (2009) 205–215 2009) presented scientific data and they concluded: "...there is adequate epidemiologic evidence to suggest a link between prolonged cell phone usage and the development of an ipsilateral brain tumor." This states that there was enough scientific data from population studies showing that long-term use of a mobile phone increases the risk of developing a brain tumour on the side the phone was held". Unfortunately, their attempts to draw attention to these important data was quashed by the mobile and wireless industry which resorted to using the tactics of the tobacco industry in the past – including funding researchers who would counter findings showing harm.

Prof. Rodney Croft, Head of the Australian Centre for RF (radio frequency) Bioeffects Research (ACRBR), an industry-funded psychologist without training in medicine or biological sciences, was quick to attack Dr. Vini Khurana when he first raised concerns in 2008, releasing an official ACRBR position statement on 8th April. The industry body Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association (AMTA) was in damage control using statements including Prof. Croft's to play down any evidence of harm.

http://www.amta.org.au/articles/Phone.claims.misleading.brain.tumours http://www.amta.org.au/articles/amta/AMTA.responds.to.television.handset.safety.claims

A Swedish research team led by neurosurgeon Dr. Lennart Hardell has been studying if mobile and cordless phone use increased the risk of brain tumours and they found that prolonged use over 10 years of both types of phones to double the risk of brain tumours – worse for those who started use young, before 20 years of age. Their results were published in reputed international medical journals: Hardell et al., Occup Environ Med. 2007 Sep;64(9):626-32; Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2006 Sep;79(8):630-9; Int J Oncol. 2008;32(5):1097-103; Int J Oncol. 2009 Jul;35(1):5-17 Söderqvist et al., Eur J Cancer Prev. 2012).

Despite the researchers of the largest study, the World Health Organization (WHO) and industry co-funded Interphone study downplayed their findings, the subset of the data on the "heaviest users" of mobile phones (they didn't assess cordless phone usage) also indicated a doubling of brain tumour risk after 10 years of use. What is alarming is that those "heaviest" users only averaged on just 27 minutes of mobile phone use per day! Unfortunately, the Interphone study had gaping methodology flaws that would dilute findings of harm. How these flaws were missed by these high profile researchers is puzzling.

On 31 May 2011, a panel of 30 experts appointed by the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified mobile and wireless (microwave or radio frequency radiation) as a class 2B possible human carcinogen after they evaluated the scientific evidence available at the time, particularly the emerging evidence linking mobile phone use to brain cancer from the Hardell and Interphone studies (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/pr/2011/pdfs/pr208_E.pdf). This placed mobile/wireless radiation in the same category as DDT and lead. Since this IARC review, more data on human brain cancers have been published, further affirming associations previously seen: that cumulative exposure to mobile phone radiation increases brain cancer risk. Collectively these data come from about 10,000 brain tumour cases. The French CERENAT study published in 2014 found a nearly tripled risk after 896 hours or more use of a mobile phone. (Occup Environ Med, 2014. 71(7): p. 514-22).

Above findings and a couple of thousand other credible studies showing different forms of harm like DNA damage, effects on the nervous, hormonal and immune systems and the brain development of children have prompted calls for caution and better regulation of public exposure from prestigious medical organizations like the American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Academy of Environmental Medicine. However, not only the public, even our medical system appears to be in the dark on this important issue due to a large number of industry-linked "experts" dominate the media - constantly downplaying the risks. This is a very complex issue. A well-worth read on this topic is Dr. Don Maisch's Australian PhD thesis is called an "An examination of the manipulation of telecommunications standards by political, military, and industrial vested interests at the expense of public health protection" (http://www.emfacts.com/the-procrustean-approach/)